



ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

MISSOURI PART B 2009-2010



Submitted January 28, 2011
Updated April 18, 2011
Office of Special Education

Table of Contents

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:	1
Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma	11
Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school	17
Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:	19
A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup	
B. Participation rate for children with IEPs	
C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.	
Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:	24
A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and	
B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.	
Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:	28
A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;	
B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and	
C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	
Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:	31
A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and	
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.	
Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:	32
A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);	
B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and	
C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.	
Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	36
Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.	40
Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	44
Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	47
Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	52

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.	56
Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:	57
A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.	
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.	
C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.	
Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. ...	59
Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.	65
Indicator 17: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.	67
Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.....	69
Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.	71
Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.	73

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

The following provides overarching information pertinent to this Annual Performance Report for 2009-10 (Federal Fiscal Year 2009 which covers the time period from July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010).

Development of the Annual Performance Report (APR)

Process used to develop the APR: Staff from the Compliance and Effective Practices sections of the Office of Special Education, staff from the Data Coordination section of the Office of Data Systems Management and staff from the Special Education Funds Management section of the Division of Financial and Administrative Services met regularly throughout the year to review and analyze data related to SPP targets and determine whether SPP improvement activities are being implemented and are effective in helping the state meet its targets. Tools such as the OSEP SPP/APR Calendar are used to help the workgroup structure its activities, and an internal tool that outlines detailed action steps for improvement activities was also developed and is used regularly as a management tool.

Stakeholder input is also crucial, and a draft of the APR and proposed SPP changes in targets and improvement activities are presented to the Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) and Missouri Council of Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE) prior to submission for their review, input and approval.

Data Collection and Reporting

Public reporting of district data: Public reports of 2009-10 district data are posted on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE) website, under School Data and Statistics at http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html. An introduction to the report explains the purpose of the public reporting and the data displayed compares district status to each SPP target for the state. The Special Education Profile is posted under the Summary Reports for each district.

Public reporting of statewide data: The State's progress and/or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets found in the SPP are reported to the public in several ways. The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Special Education State Profile is posted on the DESE website at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspped/DataCoord/documents/MOProfile.pdf>. Data are displayed for multiple years so progress and/or slippage are evident. In addition, the SPP and APR documents are posted on the DESE website at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspped/SPPpage.html>. The public are informed of the availability of these data via a special education listserv which is disseminated to a wide range of stakeholders and these resources are also publicized at statewide conferences and training events.

MOSIS and Core Data: The DESE began the transition to collecting student level data during the 2007-08 school year through the Missouri Student Information System, or MOSIS. Prior to that, the Core Data Collection System (a web-based data collection system with interactive edits) was used to gather data from districts. MOSIS includes a variety of edit checks which help school districts maintain more accurate information and manage student data more efficiently. Most Special Education data are collected through MOSIS and these data are used for SPP Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 14.

DESE Contract Development and Management System in FormHog: In May 2008 the Office of Special Education contracted with the company FormHog, Inc. to create and provide an on-line Contract Development and Management system. The purpose of this system is to develop scopes of work and budgets, provide a central location for vendor contact information, store all information related to vendor contracts (e.g. contract appendices, signed contract agreements, reports, and invoices), store all definitions for terms used in the development of forms, and track vendor programmatic, impact, and fiscal activities. An approval process is built into the system to facilitate work flow for scope of work and budget development, as well as processing invoices and reviewing reports. A data query and reporting tool has been developed. This tool enables Office of Special Education and other Department staff to evaluate vendor activities and use of funds, as well as determine the alignment of vendor activities with SPP Improvement Activities and Indicators.

Systems Administration and Monitoring

IMACS: The Office of Special Education has a web-based general supervision management system, called IMACS – Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System. IMACS was first used by districts during the 2006-07 school year and data from the system is used to address districts' performance on the SPP Indicators. The components of the system include improvement planning, compliance file reviews, corrective action plans, disproportionality and discipline reviews, and additional data collection capacity for SPP indicators not already collected through DESE's MOSIS/Core Data collection system. IMACS is used by districts to submit required information to the Office of Special Education for either the cyclical review process or for grant applications. IMACS is also available for districts to use on a voluntary basis so that improvement planning, implementation and evaluation can be on-going procedures for the district, and districts can conduct compliance file reviews at any time to self-monitor compliance with state and federal requirements.

Fourth cycle focus on State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators: The Department began the fourth five-year cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) in 2006-07. MSIP is the state's general school accreditation system which reviews all districts during the five years of the cycle. The Office of Special Education follows the same cycle for monitoring the implementation of special education in all responsible public agencies in the state. The MSIP process for fourth cycle is much more performance based than in the past, and likewise, the special education review in districts is also much more performance based and places more emphasis on improving outcomes and results for students with disabilities. Most self assessment activities that are required of districts by the Office of Special Education are based on the State Performance Plan indicators and whether the district met threshold levels related to the targets established in the SPP. If, during their MSIP review year, a district did not meet a performance threshold, the district is required to develop an improvement plan that addresses the indicator not met and is also required to conduct student file reviews of compliance indicators related to any performance area not met.

In addition to a focused file review, the Office of Special Education requires a file review for all districts during their monitoring year in the areas of postsecondary transition (Indicator 13), referral, review of existing data, and evaluation based on identified statewide concerns in these areas. In addition, the Office of Special Education collects data on initial evaluations and Part C to B transition timelines and monitors for compliance in these areas.

Corrective Action Plans are required for all identified noncompliance, and this must be corrected within 12 months of the district's notification of the findings. Compliance supervisors request additional data as part of the follow-up review. This data must indicate 100% correction of noncompliance and districts may only receive a report of correction of noncompliance when all correction is verified.

Districts must also correct findings of individual child noncompliance within 90 days of the receipt of the report of findings. Compliance supervisors request documentation showing that the individual noncompliance has been corrected and any other required actions (such as compensatory services, evaluations completed) have been put in place.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web based monitoring system (IMACS) and frequent contact with the districts by RPDC consultants and Department supervisors. When districts attend the required self assessment training and through correspondence regarding findings of noncompliance, they are informed about enforcement actions that may be taken for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months.

The monitoring/general supervision system is also closely linked with the Department's MSIP process, which is tied to district accreditation. Results of special education monitoring, including results of data reviews and improvement planning, are included in the district's MSIP report. This is important because the MSIP report receives a high level of attention from the district, the local board of education and the community.

Onsite Reviews: Missouri has continued to refine the focused monitoring onsite process based on its experience with pilot focused monitoring in 2004-05 and 2005-06 and its work with the National Center for Special Education Accountability and Monitoring (NCSEAM). In 2009-10, eight districts were selected for focused monitoring on-site reviews based upon data demonstrating a significant need for improvement in post secondary transition (graduation and/or dropout rates) and/or elementary achievement (performance on the Missouri Assessment Program). Based upon the data, three of the eight districts were identified for review in both the areas of elementary achievement and post secondary transition, two of the eight districts were identified in only the area of elementary achievement and three of the eight districts were identified in only the area of post secondary transition. Data analysis by Department staff and Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Consultants occurred prior to the review, and a hypothesis was developed to identify root causes of the district's areas in need of improvement. While onsite, the reviews included individual and group interviews of special and regular education staff, parents, and students, file reviews and classroom observations. All information gathered was reviewed by the team and used to support or deny the hypothesis. Exit conferences were held with district staff to report the team's findings and answer any questions from the districts.

Within six weeks of the review, the districts received reports of the onsite review which included a Corrective Action Plan, when necessary. The districts were required to report on activities related to the areas identified through an Improvement Plan and subsequent Activity Reports.

The Office of Special Education's focused monitoring process resembles the process being used by the Department Office of Quality Schools for the fourth cycle of MSIP which began with the 2006-2007 school year. The MSIP and the special education onsite reviews, which are aligned and complement each other, are combined when districts are chosen for both an MSIP and special education monitoring review.

Improvement planning and scoring guide: Improvement planning is used for both Improvement Grant application purposes and for district monitoring. A template for improvement plans was developed that functions as both a grant application and a self-assessment tool for MSIP purposes. The state worked with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) for the initial development of the improvement plan and scoring guide. The improvement plan is based on DESE's Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) and is part of the web-based systems of Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and Electronic Plans and Electronic Grants System (ePeGS).

The improvement plan is structured to include a comprehensive needs assessment, objectives with targets and benchmarks, and strategies with action steps and impact measures. An important part of the improvement plan is a scoring guide that itemizes and prioritizes the factors that DESE will use when evaluating the improvement plans for either grant or self-assessment purposes. The scoring guide makes it clear to districts what is expected in an acceptable improvement plan. Activity reports are required from grant districts twice yearly so that implementation and progress can be monitored. Activity reports are also required based upon the results of a focused monitoring review.

The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting the thresholds established for identified performance targets complete an improvement plan to address areas in need of improvement. Districts completing improvement plans analyze data as a part of the needs assessment. Identified areas in need of improvement are addressed through objectives and strategies.

Monitoring Process for Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS): CEIS are services provided to students in kindergarten through grade 12 (with a particular emphasis on students in kindergarten through grade three) who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general education environment. Districts using IDEA Part B funds for CEIS must submit expenditure and student data information to the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) through 1) ePeGs on the Part B Final Expenditure Report (FER), starting with the 2008-09 FER, and 2) the CEIS Reporting Verification Sheet (RVS). The amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the RVS must match the amount of Part B funds spent to provide CEIS reported on the Part B FER. Both the RVS and Part B FER are due July 30 each year.

Districts that provided CEIS using Part B IDEA funds must report the following on the FER:

- Professional development provided to teachers and other school staff
- Detail of what educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports, including scientifically based literacy instruction was provided
- Number of students who received CEIS using IDEA Part B funds who were not eligible for IDEA services at the time they received these services from your district during the school year
- Of the students who had IEPs during this school year, report the number that had received CEIS using IDEA funds anytime in the past two school years

Districts that provided CEIS using Part B IDEA funds must report the following on the CEIS RVS:

- Date the CEIS activity occurred
- Description of the CEIS activity that occurred
- Cost of the CEIS activity
- Titles of all participants that attended the activity (i.e. 4th Grade Reading Teacher)
- Number of Special Education Students served by the CEIS activity (this number should be zero as CEIS is for students without an IEP)
- Funding source to verify that districts aren't supplanting CEIS funds
- Group(s) benefiting from the CEIS activity

The Special Education Funds Management section in the Division of Financial and Administrative Services reviews the information submitted on the Part B FER in ePeGS in conjunction with the RVS. The information is evaluated for the following requirements:

- The professional development provided to teachers and other school staff that enable such personnel to deliver scientifically based academic and behavioral interventions, including scientifically based literacy instruction, and, where appropriate, instruction on the use of adaptive and instructional software, was appropriate under CEIS.
- Educational and behavioral evaluations, services, and supports, including scientifically based literacy instruction being provided, was appropriate under CEIS.
- Students receiving CEIS were not identified as Special Education students.
- Funds for CEIS supplemented and not supplanted ESEA activities.
- The LEA did not exclusively use CEIS funds for groups significantly over identified.

Upon review of district documentation, the Funds Management section informs districts of review findings. If findings conclude misuse of funds, the district is required to return these funds to the Office of Special Education from the district's state and local funds.

Program Development

Special Education Competitive Improvement Grants: The Office of Special Education has been awarding improvement grants to districts on a competitive basis for the past five years. The improvement plan described above serves as the grant application. District training on improvement planning with scoring guides is held in the fall of each year and is available to all districts in the state. The intent is to strengthen the improvement planning process at the district level to promote changes leading toward improved outcomes for students with disabilities. The districts submit activity reports during the year which serve as a progress report and an expenditure report.

Grants were awarded in the area of Elementary Achievement to 84 schools for 2009-2010. Personnel in these districts received professional development to support initiatives such as Response to Intervention (RtI), Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS), Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Co-teaching, Check and Connect, Reading First (RF), Differentiated Instruction (DI), Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM), and Aimsweb.

In addition, 38 grants were awarded funding for improvement in post-secondary outcomes of students with disabilities for 2009-2010. Personnel in these districts received professional development to support initiatives such as Response to Intervention (RtI), Transition Outcome Project (TOP), Co-teaching, Professional Learning Communities (PLC), Wilson Reading, Differentiated Instruction (DI), Schoolwide

Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS), Check and Connect, Curriculum Based Measurements (CBM), High Schools That Work (HSTW) and Aimsweb.

During October and November of 2009, individuals from 186 districts were trained at the RPDCs to develop and submit improvement plans. Of the 186 districts who attended a fall 2009 training conducted by the RPDCs, 100 submitted a Special Education Improvement Grant. Of those 100 grants submitted by trained districts, 52 (52%) received grant funds. In March of 2010, 169 grants were scored; 86 districts received grants and 83 were unsuccessful. Of the 83 unsuccessful districts, 37 (45%) of the unsuccessful districts did not attend any training at an RPDC.

The 86 successful grant districts were awarded 74 elementary achievement and 46 secondary transition grants to be implemented during the 2010-11 school year. Grants continue to fund professional development to support the implementation of systems change initiatives.

Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support Network: The mission of Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (MO SW-PBS) is to assist schools and districts in establishing and maintaining school environments where the social culture and behavioral supports needed for an effective learning environment are in place for all students. This network is comprised of the following personnel:

- State Coordinator
- Assistant State Coordinator
- Data/Web Consultant
- State-wide Secondary/Tertiary Level Consultants (5)
- Regional Consultants (24).

The Data/Web Consultant is working to formalize a cohesive system of MO SW-PBS data collection available for review at building, district, and state levels. This position also offers state-wide support through posting of various resources on the MO SW-PBS website (www.pbissmissouri.org). The Secondary/Tertiary Level Consultants guide secondary and tertiary tier implementation for buildings that have met criteria at the universal level. These consultants also train Regional Consultants to provide implementation assistance at these tiers. The Regional Consultants provide building and district level support across a spectrum of implementation issues. MO SW-PBS regularly collaborates and consults with the OSEP-funded Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports National Center located at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

The MO SW-PBS initiative has expanded from 275 buildings in 2006 to 597 buildings in 2010 at the elementary and secondary levels, with the greatest growth occurring at the secondary level. Data collected through the School-Wide Information System (SWIS) and the state-developed MO SW-PBS School Data Profile (housed within the FormHog interface) indicate that districts/buildings participating in the state SW-PBS initiative have shown improvements in student attendance, student achievement, and least restrictive environment. A complete report of MO SW-PBS data may be accessed at www.pbissmissouri.org/pubs.

Active MO SW-PBS buildings are categorized into an implementation phase based on established criteria. The categories include Preparatory, Emerging, Bronze, Silver, and Gold. In June 2010, 182 buildings were recognized for having met the criteria for Bronze, Silver, or Gold levels. These buildings qualify as state demonstration sites who share data and information on implementation of MO SW-PBS with the state as well as other schools. The MO SW-PBS State Leadership Team is continuing to develop state-wide standardized training for various audiences at building, district, regional, and state levels.

Response to Intervention (RtI): Missouri is one of eight states chosen to receive intensive technical assistance from the National Center on Response to Intervention (NCRTI). The State's current action plan with the NCRTI includes identified action steps aligning Response to Intervention (RtI) implementation with other state three-tiered model initiatives such as Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) and Professional Learning Communities (PLC), development of a plan for constructing supports and resources for RtI across the state, continued knowledge and capacity building for district staff concerning RtI implementation, and development of an assessment tool to collect data on current practices related to RtI implementation throughout the state.

Three-tiered models of intervention have long been supported and promoted by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education as both effective and efficient methods of creating responsive organizational frameworks that facilitate systems change. The primary reason for the promotion and support of these models of intervention is that they have been shown by research to positively affect student outcomes. As an extension of this work, a position was created in August of 2009 for a Director of Three-Tiered Model Coordination. The purpose of this position is to focus on promoting, coordinating, and aligning three-tiered models of intervention throughout the state. The Director also works with NCRTI as the state contact.

Another responsibility of the Director of Three-tiered Model Coordination is to carry out three-tiered model promotion in conjunction with other agencies (e.g. Center for Advancement of Mental Health Practices in Schools at the University of Missouri and the IDEA Partnership) with the ultimate goal of improved outcomes for all students. As part of the work with the IDEA Partnership, the Missouri Community of Practice (CoP) on the IDEA Partnership's SharedWork website (www.sharedwork.org) focuses on linking education and mental health stakeholder groups. Through this CoP, a successful partnership among state agencies and other education and mental health stakeholders is being developed by embracing three-tiered models as a vehicle for systems change. As part of this work, the Director of Three-Tiered Model Coordination and a representative from the Center for Advancement of Mental Health Practices in Schools (University of Missouri) recently presented at the 15th Annual Conference on Advancing School Mental Health, sponsored by the IDEA Partnership, on the continued development of this CoP. Another example of this collaborative work is the interagency workgroup, comprised of education and mental health professionals from various state and other agencies, focused on development of tertiary level SW-PBS curriculum, evaluation, and expansion of state service systems to provide activities, training, and other projects.

In an effort to further align these models, a Three-Tiered Model State Leadership Team is currently in place. This team includes the Assistant Commissioners of the Office of Quality Schools, the Office of Special Education, the Office of College and Career Readiness, and the Office of Early and Extended Learning; the Director of Three-Tiered Models of Intervention (academic RtI); the Director of School Improvement Initiatives (PLC); the Assistant Director of Effective Practices (SW-PBS); and the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Project Director. Future plans include the integration of the State Advisory Committees for PLC, MIM, SW-PBS, and academic RtI to create a single statewide Three-Tiered Model Advisory Committee. Missouri's establishment of a statewide advisory group representing all three-tiered models of intervention gives authority to an interrelated group to make recommendations to the State's Three-Tiered Model Leadership Team for consideration regarding policies, practices, procedures and decision making. This group will also enhance the collaboration among the three-tiered models of intervention currently practiced and promoted in Missouri as well as strengthen the positive impact of each model on student achievement statewide through a more clearly defined, coordinated & integrated infrastructure.

An example of a collaborative effort regarding the three-tiered model work at the national level currently providing assistance to the Department is the Missouri RtI Collaborative. This group is comprised of several national technical assistance centers that are working in conjunction with Department leadership to assist in the development of supports and resources for academic RtI. Participating technical assistance centers include the NCRTI, North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC), Center on Instruction (COI), Midwest Equity Assistance Center (MEAC), National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (NCCTQ), and the Mid-Continent Comprehensive Center (MC3) who is facilitating this collaborative. With support from the Missouri RtI Collaborative, a variety of evidence-based materials and other resources with which to consider pre-K through grade 12 RtI implementation will be provided to the Department. The Centers are also providing expertise and assistance through document review.

Information related to three-tiered model webinars, professional development provided by NCRTI, research articles, tools, and resources that schools may find beneficial as they implement systems change models continue to be disseminated statewide through the Department listservs. Additionally, the Department website currently houses the Three-Tiered Model of Intervention website

(<http://www.dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/index.html>) that references each of the three-tiered models. As one part of the plan for further enhancement of this site, Missouri is working with a regional workgroup facilitated by the Mid-Continent Comprehensive Center to develop a RtI Knowledge Base. The knowledge base will serve as a repository to house critical RtI information regarding research, implementation information, and other resources in an organized format.

Related to statewide dissemination of RtI information, five (RtI) training opportunities across the state to increase an awareness level of RtI and promote a consistent message about RtI/three-tiered models of intervention, hosted by the Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs), were recently completed. These trainings featured presentations from the national and state perspectives on RtI and its alignment with other initiatives. Schools currently implementing RtI were showcased along with discussion about resources to assist districts in exploring initial steps to implementation. These events were a collaborative effort among the Missouri RPDCs, the Department, NCRRC, NCRTI, MC3, and MEAC. The primary audience for these trainings included district staff and RPDC staff (consultants and directors). Future plans in this area include development of follow-up training activities that further promote Missouri's consistent message/philosophy of three-tiered models of intervention and provide more in-depth knowledge, materials, and resources to support schools and districts at a more advanced level of implementation. Professional development pertaining to both the foundational elements and essential components within Missouri's RtI conceptual framework for the RPDC consultants has occurred through presentations by Dr. Alan Coulter, Dr. Erica Lembke, and Dr. Daryl Mellard. A system of trainers and products to provide statewide assistance to districts implementing RtI is currently underway. A plan has been developed to provide training to the RPDC consultants in a train-the-trainer format. These trainings will take place February through June 2011. Plans for web-based follow-up activities are underway.

A final draft of the Missouri RtI Guidance Document is nearing completion and expected to be finalized and disseminated electronically by May 2011. The purpose of the guidance document is to provide an overview of RTI in Missouri and communicate Missouri's conceptual framework of the academic RTI model. Follow-up plans to the guidance document include an implementation manual that will provide more in-depth information to assist districts as they put RtI into practice.

To assist in gathering implementation information, five RtI development sites have been identified to contribute to the future implementation manual through practical district application efforts. These sites consist of twelve buildings within five Missouri school districts (8 elementary, 4 secondary). It should be noted that one of the secondary buildings in this group is located within a district that is scaling up as a part of the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM). Buildings participating in the development site work will receive resources and expertise vetted by the NCRTI and other national technical assistance centers. These buildings will utilize resources and expertise and agree to provide feedback and recommendations to the Department as the resources and tools necessary for statewide implementation are developed. Plans to secure a development site coordinator that will design, implement, and provide technical assistance to these sites are nearly finalized.

To determine the current level of statewide RtI implementation, dissemination of a self assessment survey developed by NCRTI for the purpose of gathering current RtI implementation data is underway. Beginning February 2011, NCRTI will work to assist the Department in modifying the RTI Framework Integrity Rubric into an online survey to be completed by March 2011. A plan is being developed to disseminate the online survey statewide to districts by April 2011. This data will inform the Department by creating a baseline with plans to re-administer each fall to measure growth. Additionally, this tool will also serve districts as an instrument to indicate level of readiness as well as reveal strengths, weaknesses, and highlight priority areas.

Additional future plans include development of a Higher Education Collaborative. Given that this work is in its preliminary stage, it is important to note that important groundwork is being put in place to engage Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) in the development of a Collaborative group to promote awareness and adoption of current practices in three-tiered models. Drs. Dan Reschly and Susan Smartt from Vanderbilt University have provided initial assistance in this area by presenting on evidence-based

educational practices at the Missouri Association of College of Teacher Education (MACTE) leadership team meeting in April 2010.

Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) [State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG)]: Through a State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) funded by the U. S. Department of Education in 2007, Missouri has been researching, developing, and implementing an integrated 3-tiered process for student academic and behavioral support that acknowledges and addresses diversity in student learning. The framework for supporting this model includes eleven essential features. These features represent the evidence-based practices and qualities congruent with effective schools, response to intervention and successful system-change efforts. Collectively, the tiered levels of support and the essential features are integrated within the context of schools, districts and the state to form the Missouri Integrated Model (MIM). Fourteen districts representing each of the nine RPDC regions were selected to pilot this program. Districts spent 2008-09 planning and preparing and began implementation in 2009-10. In addition to continuing to implement the model in the original pilot buildings, during the 2010-2011 school year, 9 of the 14 districts will be scaling up to additional buildings in the district to include 3 elementary buildings, 3 middle schools and 5 high schools. A critical element of the pilot is the evaluation of the model and its implementation. The results of this evaluation will inform the management team regarding any needed adaptations to the model prior to statewide scale-up. Information about the Missouri Integrated Model can be found at www.mimschools.org.

Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS) Text-to-Speech Pilot: During 2009-10, the enhancing Special Education (eSPED) with Technology Project continued work begun in 2006 with the eMINTS National Center as a proof-of-concept study. The project utilizes technology rich classrooms; Text-to-Speech software; and ongoing professional development to support and increase student achievement. The project was expanded in the 2008-09 school year to include eMINTS and Special Education classrooms in two (2) new pilot districts in outstate Missouri. Technology was upgraded in the eMINTS classrooms and the Special Education classrooms received the eMINTS technology package. The eMINTS technology rich classroom equipment minimally includes: teacher laptop and workstation, SmartBoard and projector, scanner, printer, digital camera, multiple student computers, and specific software. Teachers participated in training in the use of the text to speech software and introductory exposure to other types of assistive technology. In 2009-10, the Text to Speech/Speech to Text Software (TtS) Pilot project was expanded to Special Education teachers in 3 additional districts (10-12 classrooms) around the state with the eMINTS4All professional development program and the full complement of eMINTS4All technology resources for their classrooms. Students used technology in eMINTS or eMINTS4All classrooms. Collaborative opportunities fostered the creation of a shared knowledge base between general and special educators on the use of technology and TtS software. Current eMINTS/eMINTS4ALL teachers and special educators received training in the selection and use of appropriate assistive technology to achieve goals for students with disabilities. The Text-to-Speech software was provided and the collaborative opportunities extended in 3 additional districts (9-10 classrooms) for a total of six (6) districts, approximately 20 classrooms and 2,100 students. Technical and professional support will continue to be provided by eMINTS staff as a component of the project.

National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) Project: To address student dropout data, a comprehensive school change process that includes professional development, data-based decision-making, collaboration, action planning, and technical assistance was implemented targeting schools with a dropout rate higher than the state average (4.3% in 2008-09). In 2009-10, Missouri partnered with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) to support the implementation of effective, sustainable, and coordinated dropout prevention strategies in high schools and middle feeder schools in eight communities representative of the state (urban/rural, small/medium/large). NDPC-SD provided six days of on-site training for district personnel. NDPC-SD facilitated school's efforts using data to identify risk factors for dropout and helped identify suitable interventions to address those factors. School dropout prevention teams created action plans to be implemented during the 2010-11 school year. Data submitted during the 2010-11 school year by participant schools will include retention rates, disciplinary infractions, academic failures and monthly attendance rates.

Transition Outcomes Project (TOP): The Transition Outcomes Project was developed by Dr. Ed O'Leary at the Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center with support from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs. Through implementation in 26 states, it has been shown to be an effective model for improving compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) transition requirements. It uses a data-driven decision model that:

- Identifies and evaluates current practices used to meet transition requirements.
- Includes baseline data from students' IEPs as the context for goal setting, strategy development, and implementing a local school improvement plan.
- Promotes an IEP process driven by the student's post school goals.
- Empowers local school Office of Special Educations to make changes in systems, processes, forms, programs, and approaches.

The Department contracted with Dr. Ed O'Leary in fall 2007 to provide Transition Outcomes Project training to all Department staff, RPDC Transition Consultants and selected districts. The KU Transition Coalition assisted with the trainings and support to the RPDC staff. Baseline data was collected through the TOP training. During the 2008-2009 school years, 60 districts participated in TOP. Of these, 30 were in their first year of the process when they attended the TOP training, analyzed IEPs from their district, reported this information to all secondary special education staff in their district, and developed an action plan to improve transition planning and services.

The other 30 districts were in their follow-up year when they re-evaluated IEPs from their district to identify gains in Indicator 13 compliance. In 2008-09, recognition awards were given to 18 districts that showed substantial gains. In the 2009-10 school year, an additional 30 districts were added to the project and 50 districts are participating during 2010-11. This represents 15% of the districts in the state. Each year, Regional Professional Development Centers provide TOP training to participating districts in varying stages of implementation. This training includes assisting district teams in conducting IEP reviews, analyzing results, reporting Indicator 13 data to district staff, developing and implementing action plans, and conducting follow-up IEP reviews.

Training/Professional Development/Technical Assistance

Consultants: The Department contracts with ten Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs) across the state to provide training and technical assistance to districts through the support of the following consultant positions:

- Nineteen (19) Improvement Consultants facilitate school improvement by helping to develop and implement data-based school improvement plans. They align, coordinate, and deliver professional development through training staff and in-district trainers and provide on-going coaching related to implementing school improvement plans
- Twenty-four (24) Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for SW-PBS implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor district SW-PBS coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support districts in implementation of SW-PBS.
- Five (5) Compliance Consultants work with districts to understand compliance requirements, provide training, conduct self-reviews, and assist with writing and implementing corrective action plans.
- Three (3) Blindness Skills Specialists consult with public schools in the identification and service planning for students who are blind or partially sighted.
- Twenty (20) Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Consultants identify and recruit districts and buildings for PLC implementation, train district leadership, train and mentor building/district PLC coaches/facilitators, and otherwise support buildings/districts in implementation of PLC.

Throughout the remainder of the document, these personnel at the RPDCs will collectively be called "RPDC consultants" or "consultants."

Project ACCESS: Created in 1985, Project Access was one of the first state resource centers for autism in the nation. Project ACCESS at Missouri State University, funded 100% by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, provides autism resource information to public

schools across Missouri serving students with autism and other pervasive developmental disorders (PDD) in the form of on-site and telephone consultations, as well as support via the internet.

In addition, Project ACCESS designs autism specific professional development opportunities and trains professional credentialed individuals to present these courses through Missouri's Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDCs). These trainings are offered to Missouri school district staff and educators who work with individuals aged 0-21, who experience Autism Spectrum Disorders and related disabilities. On-site child specific consultations can be arranged through the use of Missouri Autism Consultants (MACs) and district staff can be trained to be In-District Autism Consultants (IDACs).

MO Resources (MORE): The DESE, in conjunction with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC), supports a web-based system called Missouri Resources (MORE). This system provides information on topics related to the SPP Indicators. The topics are: Academic Achievement, Disproportionality, Dispute Resolution, Dropout, Early Childhood Outcomes, Early Intervening Services(EIS)/Three Tiered Models of Intervention(Rtl), Graduation, LRE (preschool age), LRE (school age), Parent Involvement, Post-secondary Transition, and Suspension and Expulsion. Within each of the topics, information in the following areas can be accessed: Literature, Position Statement, Evidence-based Practice, Online Resource, and Definition. This system was made available to school districts in October 2007 and can be located at the following web address: <http://more.northcentralrrc.org/>.

In the 2009-10 school year, there were 73 new resources added to the MORE website and 1,491 total visitors to the MORE website.

Standards-based IEPs: The Standards-Based IEP Training is a one day (6 hour) training session for delivery by RPDC consultants for IEP teams. This training is conducted at least once annually in each region using the Standards-Based IEP Training Module. This module was developed collaboratively by the North Central Regional Resource Center, Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center, staff from three Missouri RPDCs and the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) Project Forum. The training was vetted by personnel at the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The Standards-Based IEP training takes the participant through the steps involved in developing a process of planning that improves the development of the IEP and helps the IEP team participants see the importance of connecting instructional goals to the general curriculum and grade-level standards.

Evaluation

Evaluation of SPP Improvement Activities: The Office of Special Education began work with the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC) in November of 2007 to develop a plan for evaluating the implementation and impact of all SPP Improvement Activities. The NCRRC trained Office of Special Education staff in a model for evaluating improvement activities. Using this model, Office staff has worked to review and revise all existing Improvement Activities, align the activities with all contractual activities, and develop Action Plans with implementation and impact measures for every activity. Work on the evaluation plans and implementation measures is continuing during the 2010-2011 school year. The Office of Special Education is continuing to collaborate with the NCRRC in this work. Detailed Action Plans and evaluation measures may be found at the following website: <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/SPPpage.html>.

Monitoring Priority: Free Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE)

Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma
(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report using the graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the ESEA

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	74.0% graduation rate for students with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

Per instructions for the APR in the Measurement Table, 2008-09 data is reported for this 2009-10 APR. The data match the graduation rate data for students with disabilities reported to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).

Year	Number of Graduates with IEPs	Number of Cohort Dropouts	Graduation Rate
2007-08	6,874	1,718	80.0%
2008-09	7,052	1,851	79.2%

Graduation Rate = Number of graduates with IEPs / (Number of graduates + Number of cohort dropouts)

Missouri is not yet able to calculate the graduation rate as established under the ESEA for any groups of students. Data collection changes were made in 2007-08 to collect a “first-time freshman” flag which will allow the state to begin using the ESEA graduation rate calculation for the 2010-11 graduates. This calculation will be reported with the FFY11 APR submitted in February 2013.

Graduates include students awarded diplomas based on number of credits achieved by completing regular classes, regular classes with modifications, or achieving goals and objectives on the IEP.

The State of Missouri has developed guidelines for graduation requirements for students in Missouri’s public schools. These guidelines include policy considerations for students with disabilities served under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Those guidelines include the following provisions:

- Each school district must provide a free, appropriate public education for students with disabilities until they are graduated with a regular diploma or attain the age of 21 years.
- Local school boards must establish policies and guidelines that ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity to earn credits toward graduation in a nondiscriminatory manner within the spirit and intent of that requirement as follows:
 1. Any specific graduation requirement may be waived for a student with a disability if recommended by the student’s IEP team.
 2. Students with disabilities will receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as all other students when they complete the same courses as other students.
 3. Students with disabilities who complete regular courses modified as indicated in their IEPs will receive grades and have credit transcribed in the same manner as

students who complete the courses without modification. The fact that the courses were modified may be noted on the transcript.

- Students with disabilities who meet state and local graduation credit requirements by taking and passing regular courses, taking and passing regular courses with modification, taking and passing modified classes, or successfully achieving IEP goals and objectives shall be graduated and receive regular high school diplomas.
- Students with disabilities who reach age twenty-one (21), or otherwise terminate their education, and who have met the district's attendance requirements but who have not completed the requirements for graduation, receive a certificate of attendance.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

Missouri, with a graduation rate of 79.2% reported for ESEA purposes, met the target established for 2008-09.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Manage and support the Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT) in order to establish a collaborative interagency group which will develop and oversee the implementation of a coordinated state-wide plan for post secondary transition programs and services
- Manage/support a Community of Practice (CoP) to provide educators the opportunity to share best practices, access experts in the field, and interact with other educators throughout the state.
- Recruit districts within RPDC region to participate in the Missouri Option program
- Recruit and support transition liaisons in all RPDC regions to increase state capacity to provide training and information in the area of post secondary transition
- Recruit and support Community Transition Teams in all RPDC regions to assist in the identification of local, regional and state resources to support the development and implementation of best practices.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator
- Recruit and develop "Models of Success" in post secondary transition to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on post secondary transition

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Manage and support the Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT): The Missouri Interagency Transition Team (MITT) was formed in 2007 in order to increase interagency collaboration at the state, regional and local levels. The MITT and its task forces meet quarterly to address data-driven goals for improvement and collaboration with the shared vision of improving outcomes for Missouri students (e.g., employment, independent living and postsecondary education). The MITT consists of diverse membership from a variety of state agencies concerned with postsecondary transition and provides a venue and mechanism to share information, network, and partner to coordinate professional development and activities. At this time, membership roles include the following agencies: The Missouri Parent Information and Training Center (MPACT), Missouri Administrators of Special Education (MoCASE), Missouri University of Science and Technology, Office of Adult Learning and Rehabilitation Services, Regional Professional Development Centers, Extended Employment/Sheltered Workshops, Workforce Development, Office of Special Education, Missouri Department of Corrections, as well as local-level transition coordinators and leadership. In 2009-2010 the MITT spearheaded an interdepartmental effort to decrease the dropout rate for both students with and without disabilities in Missouri. In collaboration with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD), the MITT has increased its understanding of strategies and mechanisms to decrease

dropout rates, including school teaming, data-based decision making about attendance and discipline, and school culture. Members of the MITT have attended trainings in Dropout Prevention, as well as discussed coordinating professional development efforts in this area.

Manage/support a Community of Practice (CoP): The Missouri Transition Community of Practice (MO CoP) at www.missouritransition.org is a website designed to increase collaboration and information-sharing among transition professionals and consultants across Missouri. This website includes information on upcoming events, resources, links to other websites, discussion forums and hosts events such as “Ask the Expert.” Currently 628 Missouri transition professionals are members of the Community of Practice. Professionals can create a *free account* on this website to access information and discussions. The main features of the Missouri Transition Community of Practice include:

- **Calendar** – Transition trainings and events occurring throughout the state are posted on the calendar.
- **News** – Announcements regarding training, Ask the Expert events, and Summer Institute as well as other events are shared through the news section of MO CoP. Each person enrolled in the MO CoP automatically receives an email message of any news item that is posted. This year 22 news items were posted to the site.
- **Discussion Forums** – Seven unmoderated discussion forums are listed on the MO CoP covering topics such as employment, independent living, compliance, assessment, etc. Any participant using the website can post questions, comments or replies on any of the forums. The discussion forums were viewed a total of 769 times between June 1, 2009 – May 17, 2010.
- **Ask the Expert** – The three *Ask the Expert* event topics for the 2009-10 school years were identified to correspond with the year’s training priorities of student engagement. The *Ask the Expert* events were:

Evidence-based Practices on Student Engagement & Self-Determination – Dr. David Test, Co-PI for Knowledge Generation, National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC) – Oct. 12-23, 2009 During the event, 117 people logged in a total of 450 times. Of the 25 individuals who completed the effectiveness survey, 14 posted questions, 82% indicated they were strongly satisfied with the information presented, 94% agreed that the event was very effective, and 83% felt the information was helpful and addressed important issues. A total of 72% of the respondents indicated they would use this information in the classroom.

Effective Student-Engagement to Increase Graduation Rates – Dr. Sandra Covington-Smith, National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) – Jan. 25-Feb. 5, 2010. During the event, 113 people logged in a total of 556 times. Of the 36 individuals who completed the effectiveness survey, 21 posted questions, 100% indicated they were strongly satisfied with the information presented, 100% agreed that the event was very effective, and 100% felt the information was helpful and addressed important issues. A total of 80% of the respondents indicated they would use this information in the classroom.

Comprehensive School Programs for Student Employment – Dr. Sally Morgan-Smith, North Kansas City School District & Marilyn Smith, Special School District, St. Louis – March 1 – 12, 2010. During the event, 108 people logged in a total of 467 times. Of the 32 individuals who completed the effectiveness survey, 15 posted questions, 88% indicated they were strongly satisfied with the information presented, 92% agreed that the event was very effective, and 88% felt the information was helpful and addressed important issues. A total of 80% of the respondents indicated they would use this information in the classroom.

Recruit districts within RPDC region to participate in the Missouri Option program: The Missouri Option Program is designed to target students who could complete Missouri high school graduation requirements, but for a variety of reasons lack the credits needed to graduate with their class and are at risk of leaving school without a high school diploma. The program specifically targets those students who are 17 years of age or older and are at least one year behind their cohort group or for other significant reasons that are identified in the local Missouri Option Program Plan. The Department is

working with the Office of College and Career Readiness to better disseminate information about the program and collect data on the districts offering the program and the impact on students with disabilities.

Recruit and support transition liaisons: The Missouri Transition Liaison Program was developed in 2007 to improve transition education and services in the State by identifying high performing district-level transition coordinators, secondary special education teachers & work study coordinators across Missouri. The model is adapted from both the New Mexico Transition Specialist Cadre and the Wisconsin Statewide Transition Initiative Mentor Program. Currently, twenty Missouri Transition Liaisons meet three times a year to network, share information, plan trainings, and inform statewide transition activities.

During the 2009-10 school year, twenty Transition Liaisons attended three one-day professional development sessions in Jefferson City and Columbia. Twelve 2008 Missouri Transition Liaisons mentored eight 2009 Liaisons at the first session about their role as a liaison. Liaisons increased their knowledge about transition activities for students with disabilities within their local & surrounding districts through sharing information and collaboration. The training sessions provided an opportunity to network with other “like” districts throughout the state, exchange ideas and resources, and increase knowledge about evidenced based practices. The Liaisons provide input to the agenda, professional development activities and guest speakers. The Transition Liaisons completed an electronic newsletter highlighting evidenced based practices in the area of transition which was posted on the Missouri Community of Practice. Finally, Missouri Transition Liaisons participated in a poster session at the Missouri Transition Institute in 2010, where they illustrated effective practices in transition at the local level. Missouri Transition Liaisons devote time and energy to improve transition in Missouri through increased communication and collaboration with the Regional Professional Development Centers, the Transition Coalition, and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Recruit and support Community Transition Teams (CTT): The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the KU Transition Coalition have partnered to recruit and develop Community Transition Teams (CTT) across Missouri. The goals of the Missouri Community Transition Teams are to:

- Provide an understanding of transition planning, services and research-based effective practices in transition as a framework for educators, students, families, administrators, interagency personnel, community partners, and employers, to ensure that they have the necessary knowledge and tools to improve post secondary outcomes for transitioning youth;
- Provide training and technical assistance in developing a strategic plan for community-wide transition systems;
- Improve access to employment opportunities and other post-school activities as defined in Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; and
- Elevate community awareness of, and commitment to, the improvement of post-secondary outcomes.

Community Transition Teams are comprised of a minimum of six members with at least one representative from each stakeholder group below:

- School-based transition coordinators and/or school personnel
- Family members of students with disabilities
- Vocational Rehabilitation Services staff.

Eight (8) Community Transition Teams were selected during the 2008-09 school year (cohort 1) through an application process. During the summer of 2009, nine new teams were selected through a competitive funding process to form Cohort 2. The addition of ten more teams is planned for the 2010-11 school year.

Cohort 1 and Cohort 2 teams were trained through professional development sessions held in Jefferson City. All teams met in the fall and spring and received ongoing professional development focused on self-assessment and analysis of regional needs, membership analysis, team names, and vision statements through three two-day training sessions. Action plans and goals were developed and updated on an ongoing basis as a living action plan document. Over the training sessions, guest speakers from a variety

of adult service agencies provided an overview of their program and content information specific to each community. Teams also developed a strategic plan to sustain and recruit new members to their group and a plan to continue in the future regardless of funding.

A pre and post survey was provided to 36 school members of the Community Transition Teams to evaluate the effectiveness of the training. These respondents indicated a 1 to 2 percent increase in the understanding of student involvement and self-determination, adult agency services for young adults with disabilities, how to collaborate with adult agencies, how to work with families to prepare students for adult services and outcomes, student preparation for post-secondary vocational training, employment and independent living. A pre and post survey given to nine parent members of the CTTs indicated an increase of 1 to 1.5 points in understanding how to work with educators to prepare their child for the transition to adult life, adult agency service and training opportunities and adult agency services for young adults with disabilities. Twenty-six agency members participated in a pre and post survey of CTT training. The surveys indicated a 1 to 1.5 point increase in the understanding of their involvement in school based activities, collaboration with educators and understanding how to work with families to secure necessary services.

During the 2009-10 CTT training, a pre-post Indicator 14 survey was administered and substantial anecdotal data was collected. This data showed that all 16 CTTs met their action plan goals that included: (a) hosting transition fairs, (b) developing transition resource guides, (c) building business and agency partnerships, and (d) coordinating services for individual students. New quantitative measures are currently being developed to evaluate the impact of each CTT. The results of this additional data collection and analysis will be reported in the FFY2010 APR.

An integral part of the Community Transition Teams is the Missouri Community Agency Search http://transitioncoalition.org/transition/moca/agency_search.php. The purpose of the Missouri Community Agency Search is to provide an easy, searchable database for Missouri transition stakeholders to identify community resources, agencies and information throughout Missouri which can provide services to youth with disabilities. All of the following types of agencies have been included in the Missouri Community Agency Search:

- Vocational Rehabilitation offices
- Centers for Independent Living (CILs)
- Public 2 year and 4 year colleges and universities
- Agencies providing services for people with Intellectual Disabilities

A key feature of the Missouri Community Agency Search online resource is the ability of people who use the resource to contribute to it. Participants using the resource can suggest an agency through the site. In addition to the types of agencies listed above, agencies and community services providers have been added by users of the website.

Provide targeted technical assistance: Performance data by district and region is provided annually to the regional professional development consultants to enable them to identify and provide technical assistance and professional development to districts in order to improve performance in areas of need. Using the data, consultants target districts for technical assistance. Consultant logs indicate a total of 183 visits to districts identified by the RPDCs as needing targeted technical assistance on this indicator.

Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies: See the Overview of this APR for a description of the Missouri Resources (MORE) website.

Recruit and develop “Models of Success” in post secondary transition: During 2007-08, three districts were identified as having high quality models for providing transition services by the KU Transition Coalition and the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Department). This identification was done through a nomination process. In August 2008, the Transition Coalition initiated a process to solicit additional examples of success in providing transition services. This identification process included adapting a selection criteria developed for national models of success initiative so that it was specific to Missouri. This process included a scoring rubric regarding critical

aspects of effective practices and programs. Each selected model worked with the transition coalition to create a description of the program. The Missouri Community of Practice provided graphic and text information about the models on www.transitioncoalition.org. Four Models of Success were identified in the 2007-2008 year, their final descriptions and additional materials were developed for online dissemination by the Transition Coalition during the 2008-2009 year. An additional four Models of Success were identified and developed during the 2008-2009 year. In the 2009-2010 school year six models of success were identified.

Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on post secondary transition: Through a collaborative effort between the Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education and the KU Transition Coalition, three online independent-study training modules have been developed for transition professionals in Missouri. They include case studies, performance-based assessments, and resources on transition compliance, best practices, and transition assessment, and they are available at no cost on the Transition Coalition website. *The Best Practices in Transition Planning* module was released in spring 2008, *Transition Assessment: The Big Picture* module in spring 2009 and *Student Engagement and Self-determination* module in the spring of 2010.

Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Consultants provide ongoing professional development and technical assistance to teachers and school teams within each region of Missouri. All school districts have access to a RPDC Consultant specializing in transition.

Over the past three years, four transition workshop packages have been developed for RPDC Consultants. Incorporating a train-the-trainer model, consultants provide input into the training topic and materials, observe the training being conducted, discuss adaptations to the training, and then provide the training within their regions. Consultants also participate in an online community of practice for further discussion and to share resources. During the 2009-2010 school years, the RPDC consultants conducted 87 transition workshops for professionals in their regions based on the training packages. In addition, one hundred face-to-face trainings were offered in transition planning during the 2009-2010 school year. These trainings and workshops had over 2000 registrations from transition professionals.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Targets for this indicator have been revised in the SPP to align with Missouri's ESEA Accountability Workbook. The graduation rate target statement in the workbook states, "Schools between 75 and 85 percent expected to improve at least two percentage points per year; schools with rates < 75 percent expected to improve at least five percentage points per year." Missouri has applied this target statement to the statewide graduation rate for students with disabilities (79.2%) to determine annual, numerical targets for 2010-11 through 2012-13.

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13). Two new Improvement Activities have been added in the SPP.

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE****Indicator 2:** Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement: States must report using the dropout data used in the ESEA graduation rate calculation and follow the timeline established by the Department under the ESEA

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	5.0% dropout rate for students with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

Per instructions for the APR, 2008-09 data is reported for this 2009-10 APR. The data match the dropout rate data for students with disabilities reported to the Department under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) through the Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).

Year	Number of Dropouts with IEPs in Grades 9-12	Number of IEP Students in Grades 9-12	Dropout Rate
2007-08	1,874	38,016	4.9%
2008-09	1,861	37,292	5.0%

Dropout Rate = Number of dropouts with IEPs in grades 9-12 / Number of IEP students in grades 9-12

A dropout is an individual who:

1. Was enrolled at the end of the previous school year, did not return to school after summer vacation and was not enrolled at any time during the school year, or
2. Was enrolled during the regular school term and was not enrolled on the last day of that same school term; and
3. Has not graduated from high school; and
4. Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
 - a. Transferred to another public school, nonpublic school, home school; or
 - b. Temporary absence due to suspension or verified illness; or
 - c. Death; or
 - d. Reenrolled on or before the enrollment count date of the following September.

This definition applies to all students, including students with disabilities.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

The state met the 2008-09 target for the dropout rate, but saw a very slight increase in the dropout rate from the previous year.

An analysis of disaggregated data for districts in the state show that the state's dropout rate is significantly impacted by dropouts reported by one of the two large urban districts in the state. When data from the one district is removed from the calculation, the state rate drops from 5.0% to 4.2%. Many of the improvement activities outlined in Indicator 1 are being implemented with this district. Specific technical assistance and professional development includes the following: Transition Outcomes Project; Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support; Professional Learning Communities; Quality Eligibility Determination; co-teaching; differentiated instruction; Response to Intervention; and the Statewide Transition Institute. DESE staff and RPDC Consultants are working directly with district leadership to conduct needs assessments and provide ongoing coaching and evaluation of improvement activities. Additionally, the district which is having a negative impact on the state rate, has been participating in a state partnership project with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD). This is the second year of that project. Districts involved in this project will begin collecting data during the 2010-11 school year to demonstrate their progress in the identification, retention and recovery of dropouts.

In the fall of 2009, Missouri signed a Memorandum of Understanding establishing a partnership with the National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD). The NDPC-SD will provide technical assistance in creating model schools in Missouri. These efforts will be directed at schools rather than districts. The selection process for schools to participate in this project was based on schools already identified by the Office of College and Career Readiness to participate in a Statewide Dropout Summit. The number of districts meeting these criteria was 164 of the 448 high school districts in the state. This list of schools identified as having high numbers of dropouts were evaluated based on existing programs to impact dropouts, and schools making progress in this area. These schools were eliminated from the list. A total of 42 high schools and their feeder middle schools were invited to apply to become part of the project intended to impact all students, both disabled and nondisabled. Seven schools were chosen from three geographic areas around the state, one urban, one rural and one consortium of five high schools. The schools received six days of intensive training consisting of drilling down data and identifying areas of need, as well as assistance in identifying evidenced based interventions to impact the overall number of students dropping out. All schools then developed Action Plans which they will begin implementing during the 2010-2011 school year. All schools will also continue to receive follow-up technical assistance and professional development from the NDPC-SD during the 2010-11 school year.

See Indicator 1 for information on improvement activities completed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

See Indicator 1 for Improvement Activities.

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. AYP percent = [(# of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup) divided by the (total # of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size)] times 100.
- B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in the assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year scoring at or above proficient) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year, calculated separately for reading and math)].

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	A. Percent of districts meeting AYP: 36% B. Participation rate for children with IEPs: CA -- 95% Math – 95% C. Proficiency rates for children with IEPs: CA – 67.4% Math – 63.3%

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

At 99.6% the state met the 2009-10 target for indicator 3B (participation), but did not meet the targets for 3A (AYP) at 21.3% or 3C (proficiency) at 26.2% for Communication Arts and 29.2% for Mathematics. The current statewide assessment program is composed of grade level assessments for grades 3-8. Prior to the 2008-09 school year, at the high school level, Communication Arts was assessed at grade 11 and Mathematics was assessed at grade 10.

Beginning in 2008-09 the following required End of Course (EOC) assessments were administered at the secondary level in place of the MAP: Algebra I, Biology, and English II. Government was administered as a required EOC assessment beginning in 2009-10.

Public reports of assessment data are available online at http://www.dese.mo.gov/schooldata/school_data.html and <http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/DataCoord/documents/Assessment.pdf>.

A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.

The AYP Proficiency goals for 2010 were 67.4% for Communication Arts and 63.3% for Mathematics.

Year	Subject	Districts MET for IEP Subgroup	Total Districts with N for IEP Subgroup*	Percent Met for IEP Subgroup
2005-06	Communication Arts	87	243	35.8%
	Mathematics	153	242	63.2%
	Combined – CA & Math	79	245	32.2%
2006-07	Communication Arts	32	233	13.7%
	Mathematics	69	230	30.0%
	Combined – CA & Math	25	235	10.6%
2007-08	Communication Arts	72	319	22.6%
	Mathematics	103	324	31.8%
	Combined – CA & Math	60	327	18.3%
2008-09	Communication Arts	121	331	36.6%
	Mathematics	114	327	34.9%
	Combined – CA & Math	84	334	25.1%
2009-10	Communication Arts	93	326	28.5%
	Mathematics	112	317	35.3%
	Combined – CA & Math	70	328	21.3%

* Minimum number of students with disabilities assessed in order to hold a district accountable for NCLB AYP purposes was 50 for 2006 and 2007, and 30 for all subsequent years.

B. Participation rate for children with IEPs

MAP and MAP-A Participation Rates for Students with Disabilities

	Total Students with Disabilities	Regular MAP Assessment Participation	MAP-Alternate Assessment Participation	Participation Rate
2005-06 Communication Arts	71,345	67,255	3,613	99.3%
2005-06 Mathematics	73,074	68,928	3,627	99.3%
2006-07 Communication Arts	69,622	65,083	4,090	99.4%
2006-07 Mathematics	71,069	66,479	4,103	99.3%
2007-08 Communication Arts	66,425	61,469	4,717	99.6%
2007-08 Mathematics	67,754	62,636	4,826	99.6%
2008-09 Communication Arts	67,124	61,629	5,264	99.7%
2008-09 Mathematics	66,179	60,680	5,251	99.6%
2009-10 Communication Arts	64,827	58,882	5,761	99.7%
2009-10 Mathematics	64,565	58,534	5,801	99.6%

Source: State assessment data for all students with disabilities in all grade levels assessed, including students not participating in assessments and students not enrolled for a full academic year. Participation

Rate = ((Regular MAP Assessment Participation + MAP-Alternate Assessment Participation) / Total Students with Disabilities) x 100

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.

“Proficiency” includes the top two of four achievement levels, Proficient and Advanced, on the regular MAP and MAP-Alternate assessments.

MAP and MAP-A Proficiency Rates for Students with Disabilities (includes only students with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year)

	Total	Proficient or Advanced	Proficiency Rate
2008-09 Communication Arts Total	66,904	15,778	23.6%
2008-09 Mathematics Total	65,609	16,943	25.8%
2009-10 Communication Arts Total	64,778	16,954	26.2%
2009-10 Mathematics Total	64,438	18,822	29.2%

Source: State Assessment (AYP) data

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

The percent of districts meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for Indicator 3A decreased in 2010, due to the substantial annual increases in the proficiency targets.

The state met the target for Indicator 3B and continues to maintain very high participation rates for students with disabilities.

The state did not meet the proficiency targets established for Indicator 3C for 2009-10 which are those set for No Child Left Behind (NCLB) purposes for all students. While the targets were not met, the state did see substantial progress in the percentage of students with disabilities scoring proficient or advanced.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Support the eMINTS Text-to-Speech project to assist students with print disabilities to achieve higher levels of performance in Communication Arts.
- Develop and pilot an integrated three tiered support system which will provide districts a means to integrate all of the components of effective three tiered models which address the academic and behavioral needs of all students.
- Provide information to various stakeholders on Response to Intervention (RtI).
- Provide training/pd to districts through the RPDC consultants on Response to Intervention (RtI).
- Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS).
- Support through Project ACCESS the development of services and programs to increase school districts' capacity to serve students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD).
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on accommodations and modifications to improve the achievement of students with disabilities.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.

- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans.

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Support the eMINTS Text-to-Speech project. See APR overview under category labeled Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS).

Develop and pilot an integrated three-tiered support system: See APR overview under the category labeled Missouri Integrated Model & State Personnel Development Grant.

Provide information to various stakeholders on Response to Intervention (Rtl): See APR overview under the category labeled Response to Intervention.

Provide training/pd to districts through the RPDC consultants on Response to Intervention (Rtl): See APR overview under the category labeled Response to Intervention.

Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS): See APR overview under the category labeled Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support Network.

Support through Project ACCESS the development of services and programs to increase school districts' capacity to serve students with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD): See APR overview under the category labeled Project ACCESS

Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on accommodations and modifications to improve the achievement of students with disabilities: Dissemination of trainings on accommodations and modifications are accomplished through the work of the regional Special Education Consultants described in the overview category labeled Consultants.

Provide targeted technical assistance: The Office of Special Education makes data available to RPDC Directors and Consultants on a regular basis. These data, which include data on state assessments, are used by the RPDC personnel to identify districts within their regions requiring training and technical assistance. Once districts are identified regional school improvement teams work with those districts to develop and implement an improvement plan specific to district needs. These plans include a needs assessment based upon data analysis, coaching, technical assistance and provision of professional development to district staff.

Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies: See APR overview under categories labeled MO Resources (MORE) and Consultants.

Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans: The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting the thresholds established for state assessment performance targets complete an improvement plan to address areas in need of improvement. Districts completing improvement plans analyze assessment data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, address it through an objective and strategies.

In addition to the improvement planning component of the self-assessment process, districts can apply for competitive grants in the area of elementary achievement through the development of an improvement plan. See the APR overview for more information on the activities implemented by grant recipients.

During October and November of 2009, individuals from 186 districts were trained at the RPDCs to develop and submit improvement plans. Of the 186 districts who attended a fall 2009 training conducted by the RPDCs, 100 submitted a Special Education Improvement Grant. Of those 100 grants submitted by trained districts, 52 (52%) received grant funds. In March of 2010, 169 grants were scored; 86 districts received grants and 83 were unsuccessful. Of the 83 unsuccessful districts, 37 (45%) of the unsuccessful districts did not attend any training at an RPDC.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13). The wording in two Improvement Activities has been revised to clarify terminology.

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 4: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2008-09	A: 4.0 0.8% of districts are identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates
2009-10	B: 0% of districts have significant discrepancies, by race or ethnicity, in suspension/expulsion rates; and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the discrepancies that are not in compliance

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

Per OSEP's instructions for the APR:

- 2008-09 data for 4A is being utilized
- Baseline data, targets and improvement activities for Indicator 4B are included in the SPP

With 0% districts identified with a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates, the state met the established target of ~~4.0~~ 0.8% of districts identified based on data from 2008-09.

States must look at discrepancies either:

- In suspension/expulsion rates for students with disabilities BETWEEN districts
 - Compare District X's rate to District Y's rate
- In suspension/expulsion rates for students with and without disabilities WITHIN districts
 - Compare District X's rates for students with disabilities to District X's rates for nondisabled students

The Department uses Method B.

With this APR for 2009-10, Missouri had changed the methodology used to identify districts with significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsions rates. Discipline incidents included in this analysis are any incidents resulting in out of school suspensions for more than 10 days as well as multiple short sessions summing to more than 10 days. Multiple short sessions are counted as a single incident. For each district with at least five discipline incidents for students with disabilities, the following ratio was calculated:

- Discipline Incident Rate for Students with Disabilities (Number of incidents for students with disabilities / special education child count) to
- Discipline Incident Rate for Non-disabled Students (Number of incidents for non-disabled students / enrollment)

Previously, the mean and standard deviation of the district ratios was calculated, and districts with a ratio greater than the mean + one standard deviation were considered to have a discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates. The new methodology for evaluating data for 2008-09 and future years utilizes a set cut point rather than the mean + one standard deviation to determine if a discrepancy exists. The set cut point eliminates the impact of outlier districts as well as potential changes to the mean and standard deviation if districts update their discipline data submissions.

The cut point used for Indicator 4A is 4.0. This compares to a mean + one standard deviation of 4.13 for data from the 2008-09 school year, so is a more rigorous cut point than would have been used under the previous methodology.

Once the preliminary list of districts is determined, other factors are taken into account to finalize the list of districts with significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. The following table outlines these factors:

Discipline Summary Based on 2008-09 Data

Total LEAs in state	561
Districts with five or more incidents (remainder is excluded from calculations)	97
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0	17
Districts with ratio greater than 4.0 and not low discipline rates	10
Districts with second year of identification (significant discrepancy)	0
Percent of districts with significant discrepancies	0.0%

Source: Discipline Incident Data from MOSIS Discipline Incidents file (Table 5 of Information Collection 1820-1621)

Definition of Significant Discrepancy: As described in the table above, a district would be found to have a significant discrepancy in suspension/expulsion rates if the district has a minimum of five discipline incidents and a ratio greater than 4.0 (mean + one standard deviation used for 2007-08 data), with adjustments for low discipline rates, for two consecutive years.

This determination of significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, which considers a rolling two years of data, is conducted on an annual basis for every district in the state.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

For the 2008-09 school year (based on 2007-08 and 2008-09 data) no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates. This resulted in the state meeting the target for the percent of districts identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates.

Correction of previous noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: Since no districts were identified as having significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, no districts were reviewed, and no noncompliance was identified for this indicator.

If districts had been identified, the review process would have included three basic components that address the requirement to review and, if appropriate require affected LEAs to revise their policies, procedures and practices related to development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavior support and procedural safeguards:

1. Monitoring staff review district policies and procedures related to discipline.
2. Monitoring staff conduct file reviews of students who had been long-term suspended or expelled to determine if districts are in compliance with respect to the discipline related requirements of IDEA. The indicators reviewed include such topics as provision of the procedural safeguard notice, as appropriate; conducting manifestation determination meetings; development of IEPs that document provision of services to students who are long term suspended or expelled; review/development of Behavior Intervention Plans and Functional Behavior Assessments; consideration of positive behavioral interventions and supports in the IEP.
3. Monitoring staff conduct interviews of regular and special education staff to assess their level of understanding of procedures and practices in place within district buildings related to discipline of students with and without disabilities. For example, the file reviews demonstrate documentation in the IEP, but interviews shed more light on IEP implementation practices.

Correction of Remaining FFY2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2006 or earlier.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator.
- Recruit and develop “Models of Success” in Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria.
- Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS).
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans.

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Provide targeted technical assistance to districts: Data for all districts is reviewed annually, with two years of data considered each year. Districts with one year of data that suggests discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates, along with their RPDC Consultants, are notified and offered technical assistance through their local RPDC. Any potential issues which might result in the district being determined to have significant discrepancies in the second year can then be identified and addressed.

Any districts determined to have significant discrepancies in suspension/expulsion rates based on two years of data are reviewed and, if necessary, required to develop an improvement plan and/or corrective action plan.

Provide information on evidence-based practices and strategies: See APR overview under the categories labeled MO Resources and Consultants.

Recruit and develop “Models of Success” in Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS): In June 2010, 182 buildings qualified as MO SW-PBS demonstration sites. The number of qualified buildings increased from 35 in 2006-07 to 81 in 2007-08, and again expanded to 133 in 2008-09. Additional information regarding schools serving as demonstration sites may be accessed at www.pbissmissouri.org.

Support the implementation of a statewide system of Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS): See APR overview under the category labeled Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support Network.

Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of improvement plans: Districts completing improvement plans analyze data as a part of the needs assessment. If discipline is identified as an area in need of improvement the districts may address it through objectives and strategies. Districts may also be required to develop an improvement plan when they have been identified with significant discrepancies in the area of suspension/expulsion. In both cases, RPDC consultants provide the districts with training and professional development to complete an effective improvement plan.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13) for Indicator 4A.

Baseline data and targets for Indicator 4B are included in the SPP. The target for Indicator 4B is 0%.

Improvement Activities apply to both Indicator 4A and 4B.

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: Indicator 4B is new for FFY 2009. Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities must be submitted with the FFY2009 APR.

DESE Response: Baseline data from 2008-2009, targets (0%), and improvement activities for Indicator 4B are included in the SPP revised February 2011.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 5: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	A. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class \geq 80% of the day: 59.0% B. Percent of children with IEPs inside regular class $<$ 40% of the day: 10.3% C. Percent of children with IEPs served in separate settings: 3.55%

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

At 9.6 percent, the state met the target for Indicator 5B. At 58.4 percent and 3.7 percent, the targets for Indicators 5A or 5C were not met, however improvement was shown in all areas.

Special Education Placement Data for ages 6-21

	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Inside Regular Class \geq 80% (5A)	70,011	57.1%	68,222	58.0%	66,653	58.4%
Inside Regular Class 40-79%	32,431	26.4%	30,335	25.8%	29,290	25.7%
Inside Regular Class $<$ 40% (5B)	12,279	10.0%	11,522	9.8%	10,948	9.6%
Separate School	3,856	3.1%	3,779	3.2%	3,481	3.0%
Homebound/Hospital	698	0.6%	690	0.6%	696	0.6%
Residential Facility	5	0.0%	1	0.0%	4	0.0%
Total Separate (5C)	4,559	3.7%	4,470	3.8%	4,181	3.7%
Correctional Facilities	1,051	0.9%	1,072	0.9%	952	0.8%
Parentally-Placed Private School	2,332	1.9%	2,080	1.8%	2,142	1.9%
Total School Age	122,663	100.0%	117,701	100.0%	114,166	100.0%

Source: Core Data Screen 11 – Child Count and Placements via MOSIS Student Core. The count date for each year is December 1 and are the same as the State's 618 data reported in Table 3.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

The data above indicate that the state did not meet the targets established for the 2009-10 school year for Inside Regular Class $\geq 80\%$ (5A) or separate settings (5C). The state met the 2009-10 target for Inside Regular Class $< 40\%$ (5B). While the targets for 5A and 5C were not met, the data indicates progress from the previous years in both categories.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Support the use of three-tiered intervention models and inclusive instructional practices (co-teaching, differentiated instruction).
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on evidence based instructional strategies for differentiated instruction, three-tiered models and co-teaching to promote placement with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on Standards Based IEPs to promote provision of services with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Support the use of three-tiered intervention models and inclusive instructional practices:

The Office of Special Education has numerous activities which focus on support for districts to use three-tiered models of Prevention/Intervention. Those activities are:

- **Improvement Grants:** The Office of Special Education awards \$2,000,000 in Improvement Grants to districts annually. Criteria for obtaining a special education improvement grant include an emphasis on the use of tiered-models of intervention and inclusive instructional practices (co-teaching and differentiated instruction). See Overview under the category labeled Special Education Competitive Improvement Grants.
- **Demonstration Sites:** See APR overview under the categories labeled Missouri Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support Network and Response to Intervention.
- **State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG):** The SPDG, awarded in 2007, is a project to develop and implement an integrated model of tiered student support. The project at the present time is in a pilot phase, but plans are to scale up statewide in the future. See APR overview under the category labeled Integrated Model & State Personnel Development Grant.
- **eMints:** See APR overview under category labeled Enhancing Missouri's Instructional Networked Teaching Strategies (eMINTS).

Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on evidence based instructional strategies: The Office of Special Education has developed training modules for use by the RPDC Consultants in the areas of Differentiated Instruction and Co-Teaching. The Co-Teaching materials were developed by Dr. Marilyn Friend. A DVD on co-teaching has also been produced and provided to the RPDCs to use in the trainings. Regional consultants provide at least one Co-teaching and one Differentiated Instruction training annually in each RPDC region across the state. In addition, the Office of Special Education has provided the RPDC consultants with materials and training on three-tiered models of intervention. See APR overview under the category labeled Response to Intervention.

Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants on Standards Based IEPs: See Overview under category labeled Standards-based IEPs.

Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets: The Office of Special Education makes data on educational environments by district and region available to RPDC Directors and Consultants on an annual basis. These data are used by the RPDC personnel to identify districts within their regions that are in danger of not meeting the targets for each of the sub indicators, indicating needed training and/or technical assistance. Once districts are identified regional school improvement teams work with those districts to develop and implement an improvement plan specific to district needs. These plans include a needs assessment based upon data analysis, coaching, technical assistance and provision of professional development to district staff.

The self-assessment process for special education monitoring purposes requires that districts not meeting Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) targets complete an improvement plan. Districts completing improvement plans will analyze LRE data as a part of the needs assessment and, if identified as an area in need of improvement, can address it through an objective and strategies.

RPDC Consultants continue to make trainings available to all districts, using LRE training modules for both K-12 and Early Childhood Special Education. In addition, the DESE-supported Co-teaching module, based on the trainings of Marilyn Friend was revised in 07-08 and is continuing to be disseminated by the RPDC Consultants. Office of Special Education staff is working with e-Learning for Educators to make LRE training modules accessible via the web.

Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies: See APR overview under categories labeled MO Resources (MORE) and Consultants. The Office of Special Education has also collaborated with Dr. Erica Lembke at the University of Missouri to develop a two part Rtl overview available online and in DVD format and provided for an opportunity for “ask the expert” questions from the field. The overview is available at http://dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/rti/webinars_presentations.html. Since July of 2007, 3500 copies of these DVDs have been distributed to Missouri educators, both pre-service and in-service, through conferences, workshops and US mail.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 6: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

A. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	Not applicable due to data collection changes.

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, due to federal data collection changes, states need not report on this indicator for the 2009-10 school year. New baseline data and targets will need to be established in the future.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

Not applicable

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Not applicable

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Measurement:

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of preschool children with IEPs assessed})] \text{ times } 100.$

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = $\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in category (d) divided by } [\# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus } \# \text{ of preschool children reported in progress category (d)}] \text{ times } 100.$

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = # of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus [# of preschool children reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets		
		Summary Statement 1	Summary Statement 2
2005-2006 through 2008-2009		Not applicable	Not applicable
2009-2010	A: Social Emotional	83.3%	49.9%
	B: Knowledge and Skills	84.3%	38.1%
	C: Behaviors	81.5%	54.5%

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

	A: Positive social-emotional skills		B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills		C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs	
	# children	% children	# children	% children	# children	% children
a. Did not improve functioning	75	1.6%	94	2.1%	89	1.9%
b. Improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable	202	4.4%	164	3.6%	199	4.4%
c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers	1,848	40.4%	2,387	52.2%	1,569	34.3%
d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable	1,314	28.7%	1,342	29.4%	1,423	31.1%
e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable	1,133	24.8%	585	12.8%	1,292	28.3%
Total	4,572	100.0%	4,572	100.0%	4,572	100.0%

Summary Statements for 2009-10

	A: Positive social-emotional skills	B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills	C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs
	% of children	% of children	% of children
1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome, the percent that substantially increased their rate of growth in the Outcome by the time they exited	91.9%	93.5%	91.2%
2. Percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome by the time they exited.	53.5%	42.1%	59.4%

Definition of “comparable to same-aged peers”: Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit by the ECSE personnel, “comparable to same-aged peers” is defined as a rating of “5” on a scale of 1-5, meaning “completely (all of the time/typical)” in response to the question “To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?” A rating of “5” roughly translates to a 0-10% delay.

Instruments and Procedures for Assessment and Data Reporting of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO):

- First Steps and ECSE use multiple sources of information rather than a single approved assessment instrument. A decision was made to allow the ECSE personnel to determine the appropriate assessment tools to use to collect data for this indicator. No approved list of instruments has been or will be compiled.
- The Missouri Outcomes Summary Sheet (MOSS) is used to synthesize the information into a comprehensive summary. The MOSS is located online at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html>
- The MOSS is used to provide standard documentation statewide for reporting to DESE
- Each eligible child entering First Steps or ECSE beginning October 2006 must have an ECO rating if the child will be in the program at least 6 months
- No sampling is used. All children with potential of being in the program for six months or more will be assessed
- Entry and exit data must be recorded on the MOSS within 30 days of eligibility determination and exit from the program, respectively
- A rating between 1-5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning “Not Yet” and 5 meaning “Completely”
- All entry and exit data collected during a given year must be submitted electronically to DESE at the end of that year
- The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings
- More information can be obtained at <http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html> and in the SPP

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

Missouri met all six targets for the two summary statements for outcomes A, B and C.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Provide Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) training through periodic face to face and online trainings to improve administration of the ECO assessment and data collection and reporting for Early Childhood Outcomes
- Evaluate First Steps and ECSE ECO data through the use of common identification numbers (MOSIS) on an annual basis to ensure the reliability and validity of the data
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

ECO Training: In November of 2009, the Department held a statewide training on administration and reporting of data for the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Assessment. This training was attended by approximately 300 Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) personnel and Part C (First Steps) System Point of Entry staff. Subsequent to that training, all training materials and a video of the presentation were posted on the Office of Special Education website at <http://dese.mo.gov/divspeced/ECOtraining.html>. ECSE program and SPOE administrators receive regular reminders through their Listservs regarding the availability of the materials and the importance of training for staff who will be administering the assessment and the timely and accurate reporting of the

data. Plans are in place to move this training to an eLearning environment so it is more accessible and participation can be tracked.

Evaluate ECO data: Cross checks were performed to analyze whether improvements were made in agencies using First Steps (Part C) exit ratings for ECSE entry ratings. The number of agencies utilizing the First Steps exit ratings for ECSE entry ratings has nearly doubled from 2008-09. Telephone calls and emails were placed/sent to school districts that reported child count numbers for the December 1 cycle but had not reported entry/exit ratings for those children to ensure the entry of necessary/correct data. Telephone calls and emails were also placed/sent to those districts who reported entry/exit dates but with no ratings to ensure the entry of necessary data.

Targeted technical assistance: The Office of Special Education makes data available to RPDC Directors and Consultants on a regular basis. ECO data were first publicly reported for the 2009-10 school year, and will be shared with the RPDC personnel in order to identify districts within their regions requiring training and technical assistance.

Provide information on evidence based practices: See APR overview. Identification and dissemination of evidence-based practices are described in the overview categories labeled MO Resources and Consultants.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

Per OSEP requirements from the June, 2010 Response Table, the 2010-11 targets for Indicator 7 have been revised to show improvement over the baseline and are included in the revised SPP dated February 1, 2011.

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: The State must revise its FFY 2010 targets to show improvement over the baseline.

DESE Response: Targets for Indicator 7 have been revised to show improvement over the baseline and are included in the SPP revised February 2011.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Indicator 8: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

Measurement: Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{\# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities}}{\text{total \# of respondent parents of children with disabilities}} \right] \times 100$.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	77.5% of parents will report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

Missouri, at 69.3% of parents reporting that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities, did not meet the target established for the 2009-10 school year.

The Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) has the responsibility of reviewing and accrediting the 523 school districts in Missouri on a five-year review cycle. MSIP reviews are conducted each year for approximately 100 (or 20%) of the 523 districts as well as other responsible public agencies. These reviews include the distribution of surveys to students, teachers, administrators and parents. Parent surveys are used to collect information on participation in special education and other programs, the level of parental involvement in various school related activities, and parent perceptions of school, staff, teachers, administrators and learning environment. The surveys are sent to all parents in the approximately 100 school districts undergoing MSIP reviews each year.

Survey Instrument: The complete MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire (AQ) can be found at <http://www.dese.mo.gov/divimprove/sia/msip/advquest/parent.pdf>.

The MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire contains two items directly related to this indicator:

- My involvement in my child's education has improved his/her achievement.
- The school encourages parents to be involved.

If parents agree or strongly agree with both, then they are counted as being in agreement with this SPP indicator.

The table below shows the rates of agreement with both items for parents of students with disabilities. Results from all respondents and results from a derived representative sample are provided.

The parent survey asks for demographic data, including basic household information, race, age, education level and income, among others.

The University of Missouri Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis (OSED) has an existing model for constructing a "state sample" from Advance Questionnaire data. The model is based on two criteria: Percent Free & Reduced Lunch (FRL), and Minority status (Minority=Black, Hispanic, Asian; Majority=White). The first step determines the FRL characteristic of each school building in the state and divides them into three groups. The second step determines the overall student enrollments, as well as

the Minority/Majority enrollments at the state level, within each of the above FRL categories. This produces a stratified sampling scheme at the state level which contains six cells:

FRL	Minority	Majority
Less Than 33%	cell 1	cell 2
33% to 54%	cell 3	cell 4
55% or More	cell 5	cell 6

Valid and reliable data: A sample of 2,001 Special Education parents was drawn using the above sampling scheme. The results from the sample were slightly less than the results from all respondents shown below (71.2% for sample and 72.3% for all respondents). The differences in the percents in agreement are not significant, thereby establishing the reliability of the data. The validity of the data is ensured through use of the MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire, which has been determined by OSEDA to be a valid instrument for gathering data from parents.

Results of Parent Survey

	Agree	Not Agree	Total
2009-10 Parents of Students with Disabilities	4,565 (69.3%)	2,027 (30.7%)	6,592 (100.0%)
2008-09 Parents of Students with Disabilities	5,103 (69.6%)	2,234 (30.4%)	7,337 (100.0%)
2007-08 Parents of Students with Disabilities	4,077 (72.3%)	1,560 (27.7%)	5,637 (100.0%)
2006-07 Parents of Students with Disabilities	4,461 (69.4%)	1,965 (30.6%)	6,426 (100.0%)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

With an agreement rate of 69.3%, the state did not meet the target of 77.5% established for the 2009-10 school year. Due to the process of using MSIP Advance Questionnaire data for this indicator, each year is comprised of a new set of districts making it difficult to analyze progress or slippage and any effects from the implementation of Improvement Activities. However, as can be seen from the chart above, the trend of agreement has clustered consistently around 70% with the exception of the 07-08 data being slightly higher. As MSIP is a five year cycle and 2010-2011 is the last year of that cycle, data for this year will be collected and reviewed to determine if it is advisable to consider resetting the targets for this indicator. New improvement activities are also being added to this indicator. Also, as discussed below under "Improvement Activities for 2009-2010" the Office of Special Education will be working with the Office of Quality Schools at the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis at the University of Missouri to develop an improved data collection process to measure this indicator.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Develop an improved data collection process to measure parent involvement.
- Support Missouri Parent Information and Training Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent/family involvement to families, LEAs and technical assistance providers.
- Support through the MPACT a parent mentor program that provides Technical Assistant (TA) and support to parents of students with disabilities.
- Support, through Project ACCESS and MPACT, the provision of materials, information, training, and resource referrals for parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD).

- Support professional development for Parents as Teachers (PAT) parent educators to increase their knowledge and ability to inform and assist families of children with disabilities to link with needed resources
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator
- Recruit and develop “Models of Success” in parental involvement to improve programs and services for students in Missouri using established criteria

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Data Collection Process: The Office of Special Education identified five questions from the NCSEAM parent survey to be included on the 2010-11 Parent Questionnaire (AQ). Staff are also currently working with the Office of Quality Schools at the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis at the University of Missouri to develop an improved data collection process to measure parent involvement.

Support MPACT: The Department contracts with the Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT) to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent and family involvement to families, LEAs and technical assistance providers. The Department supports MPACT to provide training, resources and materials regarding parent/family involvement to families, LEAs and technical assistance providers. Information in the following areas were provided through the MPACT newsletter: IEP process, other IDEA processes, the Americans with Disabilities Act, FERPA, and Section 504 of the ADA. The MPACT e-newsletter was sent bi-monthly via listserv and posted on the MPACT website. Online database resources were frequently updated to fulfill DESE's reporting requirements. There were 118 updates made to the MPACT website during this quarter including the archiving of the E-newsletter, mentor monthly trainings and state resource listings. The website received 34,621 page views during this quarter; 20,408 of which were unique web hits. Parent materials providing information on special education process, IDEA updates, effective practices, state-wide assessment, and research based intervention were provided to the public using various means of distribution. Parent training information was also disseminated through the SW-PBS and RTI pages on the MPACT web site. The MPACT SW-PBS web page received 454 hits during the year; the RTI web page received 334 hits.

Parent Mentor Program: To facilitate parent involvement in the LEA and to provide peer support to parents in the special education process, The Department supports through the Missouri Parent Training and Information Center (MPACT) a parent mentor program that provides technical assistance and support to parents of students with disabilities. MPACT employs and supports six regional Coordinators, one Mentor Coordinator and 48 parent mentors. MPACT recruits and trains mentors and assists with the certification process. MPACT provides assignments and technical assistance to mentors. This assistance includes coordination and support through monthly trainings and quarterly mentor meetings. MPACT also provides training in data collection for mentors. Online access to monthly trainings, reporting, surveys and technical support is available via a secure site on MPACT's website. In the 2009-2010 school year professional development was delivered to mentors who give peer support to parents in the IEP process. MPACT staff also provided modeling of the IEP process for parent mentors and evaluated the performance of mentors during the IEP process. Information was provided to parents and professionals about three-tiered interventions and progress monitoring via an online training.

Collaboration with ACCESS: MPACT and Project ACCESS collaborated to create materials, information, training and resources for parents of children with Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD). A training dealing with writing post secondary goals for students with ASD to assist with transition was completed in the summer of 2010 and dissemination will begin in the 2010-11 school year.

Support Parent Educators: There were fifty scholarships awarded to parent educators across the state selected by the Parents as Teachers National Center (PATNC). Parent educators eligible for these scholarship awards must have successfully completed PATNC's initial Born to Learn Institute and be working in a Missouri Parents as Teachers program. Announcement letters were mailed to all district

PAT Coordinators inviting them or a parent educator they supervise to apply for a scholarship to the Special Needs training. The deadline for submission was September 10, 2009. There were 94 applications submitted from 88 districts. Awards were chosen by the date of return and whether the applicant had attended in the past.

The Parents as Teachers National Center surveyed those individuals receiving the training. Of the 35 respondents 100% of them agreed the training supported their work with children and families. The respondents also indicated the information from the training had:

- been shared with the families they serve (30) and coworkers (32),
- helped them to better identify delays or behaviors which might warrant intervention (32),
- helped them to know how to make referrals to the appropriate sources (33), and
- helped them use the information to promote positive intervention strategies for children (33).

In addition, all respondents indicated they had used the materials provided. The Special Needs Guide was reported to be utilized between 1-10 times (33), National Early Intervention or State Resources pages (35) and the handouts between 1-10 times (29).

Targeted Technical Assistance: Data was provided to the Regional Professional Development Consultants through a listing of districts who did not meet targets on the MSIP Parent Advance Questionnaire data for Indicator 8.

Evidence based practices: See APR Overview under the category labeled MO Resources. The MORE website provides information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator. In the 2009-10 school year, two added resources were specifically for parents.

Models of Success: During 2009-10, an initial district was identified through a nomination process as having high quality models for encouraging parent involvement by the Department. In the fall of 2010, Missouri initiated a process to solicit additional examples of success in supporting parent involvement programs. This identification process included adapting a selection criteria developed for national models of success initiative so that it was specific to Missouri. This process included a scoring rubric regarding critical aspects of effective practices and programs. Each selected model will work with the Department to create a description of the program. The Department webpage will provide information about the models.

The Office of Special Education has also been collecting information from the 14 pilot schools/districts that participate in the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) integrated model (MIM) project (see Overview for more information). Parent and Community Involvement is one of the eleven essential elements in this model and all of the 14 districts have been developing and implementing research-based parent involvement activities as a part of their MIM activities.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13). One new Improvement Activity has been added to the SPP.

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 9: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and underrepresentation) of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2009 reporting period, i.e., after June 30, 2010. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	0% of districts will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

The state met the 2009-10 target of 0% of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) (0/561 LEAs = 0%) having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

The state's identification method uses a rolling two-year approach and examines risk ratios and cell sizes for all racial/ethnic groups. For the special education total and by disability category (using state-reported Section 618 data), risk ratios are computed for every racial/ethnic group. Based on this, the working definition of disproportionate representation is a risk ratio of greater than 2.5 for over-representation or less than 0.25 for under representation for two consecutive years, along with a minimum of 20 students in the racial/ethnic group being considered as well as in the comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups) for those two years. Unique district characteristics are also considered so that districts are not identified as having disproportionate representation if the data are solely due to group homes or treatment centers where students are publicly placed in the district boundaries or other similar situations. The table below summarizes the criteria.

Criteria/Definition of “Disproportionate Representation”

Risk Ratio	Cell size
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation OR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 0.25 for under representation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 20 in racial/ethnic group AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 20 in comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)

Data for all districts/LEAs are examined every year. Using a cell size of 20 for both the racial/ethnic group and the comparison group of all other racial/ethnic groups, out of a total of 560 local education agencies, the following numbers of districts were examined for disproportionate representation:

- White: 106
- Black: 80
- Hispanic: 40
- Asian: 19
- Native American: 4

Based on the information above, a total of 106 districts had the minimum “n” size for one or more racial/ethnic groups. This resulted in 454 (560 – 106) unduplicated districts excluded from the calculations.

The following table displays the numbers of LEAs meeting the criteria for two consecutive years and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation. As stated previously, LEAs are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

Year	Number of LEAs meeting “over” or “under” criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)	Number of LEAs with Disproportionate Representation as a result of inappropriate identification
2009-10 identification using data from 2008-09 & 2009-10	0 LEAs under and 0 LEAs over in any race/ethnicity category	0

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on MOSIS/Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (MOSIS/Core Data Screen 16) for a total of 560 LEAs.

If LEAs had been identified, the review process would consist of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. For each student file reviewed, a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated. Then a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated for all students in a particular disability category (or total special education) and racial/ethnic group (i.e. black students with disabilities, white students with disabilities, black MR students, white MR students, etc). The percent in compliance for each disability/race are then compared, and if results for the group that was identified as being over or under-represented are significantly below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education.

Any individual student non-compliance identified during the reviews must be corrected, even if the review does not result in a finding of noncompliance based on inappropriate identification.

As indicated in the table above, in 2009-10 no LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2008-09 and 2009-10, therefore no

reviews were conducted, resulting in no LEAs with disproportionate representation of any racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

0% of LEAs (0 / 560 = 0%) in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that were the result of inappropriate identification since none had disproportionate representation. See Indicator 10 for information on the review process directed towards specific disability categories.

Correction of previous noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: There were no findings of noncompliance as a result of reviews during 2008-09; therefore no correction was required.

Correction of Remaining FFY2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2006 or earlier.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

The state met the 2009-10 target of 0% of LEAs having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Provide training and information to districts on the state's process for identification and review of districts with disproportionate representation
- Provide training and professional development resources to districts identified with inappropriate identification.
- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

Provide training and information on identification and review process to districts: The initial identification is based on the Special Education child count and district enrollment data. Information on the identification and review process of districts is included in various trainings regarding Special Education data and compliance such as New Directors of Special Education Institute held in July 2010, Special Education Administrators Conference held in September 2010, monthly webinars, and Special Education monitoring training held in October and November 2010. Districts identified as having disproportionate representation are assigned a special education staff supervisor to assist them with the monitoring process.

Provide training and professional development: Training and professional development from Regional Professional Development Center Special Education Improvement Consultants are available to aid in developing strategies to increase instructional effectiveness for all students. A self assessment tool from the National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems (NCCRESt) that allows schools to conduct a self assessment of their programs and practices in five domains; (a) School Governance, Organization, Policy, and Climate, (b) Family Involvement, (c) Curriculum (d) Organization of Learning and (e) Special Education Referral Process and Programs available at <http://www.nccrest.org/publications/tools/assessment.html> The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education has made available numerous resources to improve instructional effectiveness through the use of tiered intervention models that may be accessed at <http://dese.mo.gov/3tieredmodels/> While accessing these resources in not a requirement districts identified as having disproportionate representation are encouraged to use these resources for the purpose of enhancing instructional

effectiveness in order to increase student achievement thereby assisting the district in discontinuing its follow-up status.

Targeted Technical Assistance: Data for all districts is reviewed annually, with two years of data considered each year. When data suggest that disproportionate representation is or could become an issue, districts and their RPDC Consultants are notified. Technical assistance is available through the RPDCs.

Identify and Disseminate Training and Technical Assistance Resources and support for identified districts: See APR overview under the category labeled MO Resources.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Indicator 10: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation."

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2008, describe how the State made its annual determination that the disproportionate representation it identified (consider both over and under representation) of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum 'n' size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2009, i.e., after June 30, 2010. If inappropriate identification is identified, report on corrective actions taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	0% of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

The state met the 2009-10 target of 0% of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) (0/560 LEAs = 0%) having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

See information in APR Indicator 9 for a description of the methodology used to identify and review LEAs with disproportionate representation. The table below summarizes the criteria used for identifying under and over representation for all racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories.

Criteria/Definition of “Disproportionate Representation”

Risk Ratio	Cell size
Greater than 2.5 for overrepresentation OR Less than 0.25 for under representation	At least 20 in disability and racial/ethnic group AND At least 20 in disability and comparison group (all other racial/ethnic groups)

Data for all LEAs are examined every year. Using a cell size of 20 for both the racial/ethnic group and the comparison group of all other racial/ethnic groups, out of a total of 560 local education agencies, the following numbers of districts were examined for disproportionate representation:

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Unduplicated Districts Included	Unduplicated Districts Excluded
SLD	57	49	17	2	2	57	503
Autism	13	6	1	2	0	14	546
Sp/Lang	44	33	14	4	0	45	515
ED	24	18	1	0	0	24	536
MR	23	20	2	1	0	23	537
OHI	35	29	1	1	0	35	525

Based on the table above, 61 districts were evaluated for one or more disability and race/ethnicity combinations. This results in 499 (560-61) unduplicated districts excluded from the calculations.

The following table displays the numbers of LEAs meeting the criteria for 2009-10 and indicates which racial/ethnic group was identified and whether it was over- or under-representation for each disability category. As stated previously, LEAs are considered to have disproportionate representation, and are subject to a review of policies, procedures and practices, if they meet the criteria for two consecutive years.

Year	Number of districts meeting “over” or “under” criteria for two years (Disproportionate Representation)	Number of districts with Disproportional Representation as a result of inappropriate identification
2009-10 identification using data from 2008-09 & 2009-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLD: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category • Autism: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category • Sp/Lang: 0 under and 0 over in any race/ethnicity category • ED: 1 LEA with over-representation of black students; 0 under in any race/ethnicity category • MR: 3 LEAs with over-representation of black students; 0 under in any race/ethnicity category • OHI: 1 LEA with under-representation of Asian students; 0 over in any race/ethnicity category 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLD: 0 • Autism: 0 • Sp/Lang: 0 • ED: 0 • MR: 0 • OHI: 0

Source: Risk ratio calculations based on special education child count data (Table 1 of Section 618 data gathered on MOSIS/Core Data Screen 11) and total district enrollment (MOSIS/Core Data Screen 16) for a total of 560 LEAs.

Note: Information provided for the following disability categories: Specific Learning Disabilities (SLD), Autism, Speech/Language (Sp/Lang), Emotional Disturbance (ED), Mental Retardation (MR), and Other Health Impaired (OHI).

As indicated in the table above, for 2009-10, five districts were determined to have disproportionate representation based on special education child count data from 2008-09 and 2009-10, one in the area of over-representation of black students with Emotional Disturbance; three in the area of over-representation of black students with Mental Retardation; and one in the area of under-representation of Asian students with Other Health Impairment.

Four of the five districts had previously had a monitoring review conducted which showed that disproportionate representation was not a result of inappropriate identification. The review process consists of a review of policies, procedures and practices and a review of student files in the areas of referral, evaluation and eligibility determination. For each student file reviewed, a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated. Then a percent of indicators in compliance is calculated for all students in a particular disability category (or total special education) and racial/ethnic group (i.e. black students with disabilities, white students with disabilities, black MR students, white MR students, etc). The percent in compliance for each disability/race are then compared, and if results for the group that was identified as being over or under-represented are significantly below other racial/ethnic groups, that group would be found to have inappropriate identification in the particular disability category or in special education.

For the fifth district which had underrepresentation of Asian students identified in the category of OHI, an analysis of statewide assessment program data showed that in this district Asian students score consistently higher than other racial/ethnic groups and are, thus, less likely to be referred for special education, therefore, it was determined that no review was required for this district.

0% of districts (0 / 560 = 0%) in the state had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

Correction of Previous Noncompliance: No districts were identified as having disproportionate representation as a result of inappropriate identification during 2008-09, therefore there was no noncompliance to correct.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

The state met the 2009-10 target of 0% of districts having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification.

See Indicator 9 for a discussion of improvement activities completed.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Indicator 11: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in a but not included in b. Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	100% of children will be evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

While Missouri did not meet the target of 100%, evaluations were completed within timelines 96.8% of the time.

The State of Missouri uses the 60 day timeline for completion of initial evaluations which is the same as the federal timeline; however Missouri regulations allow for an extension of the timeline if there are exceptional circumstances such as delays due to family or child illness or school delays due to inclement weather or extended school breaks.

The State Regulations (Regulation III – Identification and Evaluation Page 32-33.

http://dese.mo.gov/schoollaw/rulesregs/Inc_By_Ref_Mat/documents/FinalRegulationIIIIdentificationandEvaluation4-07.pdf) include the following language regarding initial evaluation timelines:

Evaluation Timelines

The public agency shall provide the parent with a Notice of Intent to Evaluate as soon as possible, but within thirty (30) calendar days of the date of referral for evaluation. Delays beyond this time may be permitted for just cause (school breaks for summer or holidays, student illness, etc.) and documented in the student's record.

The evaluation shall be completed and a decision regarding eligibility rendered within sixty (60) calendar days following parent consent or notice, as the case may be. Delays beyond this time may be permitted for just cause and documented in the student's record.

Initial Evaluation (34 CFR 300.301)

Each public agency shall conduct a full and individual initial evaluation, in accordance with 34 CFR 300.305 and 34 CFR 300.306, before the initial provision of special education and related services to a child with a disability. This may or may not include additional testing as determined by the evaluation team members.

Either a parent of a child or a public agency may initiate a request for an initial evaluation to determine if the child is a child with a disability.

The initial evaluation must be conducted within sixty (60) days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation, may be extended for just cause, and must consist of procedures to determine if the child is a child with a disability as defined in this State Plan and to determine the educational needs of the child.

If a parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for evaluation or, if a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the evaluation timeline has begun and prior to the determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability, the sixty (60) day timeframe does not apply. An exception to this applies only if the subsequent public agency is making sufficient progress to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation, and the parent and the subsequent public agency agree to a specific time when the evaluation will be completed.

The screening of a student by a teacher or specialist to determine appropriate instructional strategies for curriculum implementation shall not be considered to be an evaluation for eligibility for special education and related services.

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of initial evaluations within 60 days, districts completing a self-assessment for special education monitoring purposes are required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program. Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state.

These data were gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS). Districts entered the following information for each student referred for initial evaluation during the reporting period:

- Student's initials
- Date of parental consent to evaluate
- Date of eligibility
- Student eligible Y/N
- Eligibility determined in 60 days (calculated Y/N)
- If No, reason for delay
 - Acceptable reason Y/N

Verification of the district reported evaluation timeline data was completed by compliance supervisors or by on-site visits conducted by compliance supervisors and other assigned DESE staff.

The file review process included checking the 60-day evaluation timeline information by using a calendar system. If the districts included initial evaluation timelines which were not within 60 days, the following criteria were accepted as reasons for extending the evaluation timelines:

- Snow days or other school closures due to inclement weather
- Agency vacation days
- Child's absence because of illness
- Summer break
- Parent refuses/fails to produce child
- Change in district of enrollment during evaluation process (per 300.301(d))

Delays were considered out of compliance if the reasons for the extensions did not meet the established acceptable criteria or if the districts failed to provide a reason for the extension of the timeline.

Year	Number with consent to evaluate	Number within 60 day timeline	Number > 60 days with acceptable reason	Number within 60 days or with acceptable reason	Percent within acceptable timelines
2009-10 Total	3,763 (a)	3,297	346	3,643 (b)	96.8%

Calculation = $(b / a) \times 100$ where a=the number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received; b=the number whose evaluations were completed within 60 days or with acceptable reason.

Source: Data reported via IMACS from a total of 111 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2009-10. A total of 107 of the 111 districts conducted initial evaluations during the year. Acceptable delays are included in the numerator and denominator of the percent within acceptable timelines.

Two children who fell within the exceptions in 34 CFR 300.301(d) were excluded from the numerator and denominator of the calculation.

Year	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Percent within acceptable timelines	94.7%	94.0%	97.1%	97.8%	96.8%

The number of days past the 60 day timeline ranged from one day to 122 days, with approximately 75% of the delays due to acceptable reasons. Approximately 80% of the delays were 20 days or less with 53% of the delays 10 days or less and 33% of the delays 5 days or less. The longest unacceptable delays were due to evaluation/testing information not being completed or returned in a timely fashion. Most timelines deemed unacceptable were due to valid extensions that did not cover the entire amount of delay (i.e., delay was 10 days, but only 6 of those days had acceptable reasons); delayed evaluations; or lack of specific information from the districts as to the length of school breaks. The districts found out of compliance with this indicator were required to complete corrective action plans and correct the noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of notification.

Correction of previous noncompliance

Correction of FFY2008 Findings of Noncompliance: Three districts had findings of noncompliance issued in 2008-09. The state, through its follow-up procedures of submission of additional timeline data for initial evaluations in IMACS, verified that all three districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification. The state also verified that, in addition to the three findings of noncompliance, all individual noncompliance was corrected as soon as possible, but in no case later than one year of notification.

Correction of Remaining FFY2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2006 or earlier.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

At 96.8%, the state is not meeting the target of 100%, but is continuing to address this indicator at a high rate of compliance. While the 96.8% rate is a 1% decrease from the previous year, an analysis of the data shows that this represents a very small number (4) in the increase of students not evaluated within timelines. It has been determined through a review of the improvement activities that no changes or additions need to be made at this time.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Provide targeted technical assistance to districts identified as not meeting or in danger of not meeting state targets based on evaluation of data provided by DESE in order to improve performance on this indicator.
- Provide training and professional development to all districts to increase compliance in the area of initial evaluation timelines.
- Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

Targeted technical assistance: State Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Special Education Compliance Consultants worked with Office of Special Education Compliance supervisors to target the districts who needed assistance in meeting the 60 day timeline for completing initial evaluations. Compliance supervisors notified RPDC compliance consultants of districts who received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in the area of 60 day timelines. Upon notification, the RPDC consultants worked with districts to assist them in determining the reasons for the delays and to ensure they developed strategies to correct the non-compliance.

Ongoing training and professional development: Each district being reviewed in the special education monitoring cycle is required to attend self assessment training in the fall prior to their MSIP review year. In this training emphasis is placed upon public agencies completing the evaluation process within 60 calendar days. Acceptable reasons for an extension to the 60 day timelines are reviewed during the self-assessment training also.

In order for new directors in the state to be properly informed and to provide guidance to their district staff regarding the 60 day timeline for evaluation, compliance training with emphasis on this timeline is a part of the Annual New Director's Training.

The Office of Special Education website has web stream presentations that provide training on the 60 day timeline requirement. Finally, listserv messages by numerous Office of Special Education staff and webinar presentations by the Assistant Commissioner of Special Education remind public agencies of the importance of adhering to this timeline.

Evidence based practices and strategies: See APR overview under the category labeled MO Resources.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2008, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. When reporting the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY2009 APR, that it has verified that each

LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has

completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02). In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.

DESE Response: The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled “Correction of Previous Noncompliance.” The state was able to verify that all LEAs with identified noncompliance (1) were correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 12: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.
- e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Account for children included in a but not included in b, c, d or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	100% of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

With 95.0% of Part C to Part B transition timelines met for 2009-10, Missouri did not meet the target of 100%, but showed improvement over the previous year.

In order to capture data for Missouri districts' compliance for completion of C to B transition timelines, districts, as part of a self-assessment for special education monitoring, were required to report evaluation timeline information. The special education monitoring cycle is the same as that used for the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP), which is the state's accreditation program. Approximately one-fifth of all districts are reviewed each year, and for special education monitoring purposes, districts conduct a self-assessment in the year prior to their MSIP review year. Each of the five cohorts of districts is comprised of large and small districts that cover all regions of the state.

Data for 2009-10 were gathered in the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) which is used by districts to enter self-assessment information. Districts enter the following information for each student referred from Part C during the reporting period:

- Student's initials
- Date of birth
- Date of referral
- Parental Consent Received (Y/N)
- Date of eligibility
- Date of IEP
- IEP in place by third birthday (calculated Y/N)

- If No, reason for delay
 - Acceptable reason Y/N

The information is reviewed by Compliance supervisors as a part of the desk review of the self-assessments.

Reasons given for delay in eligibility determination and IEP development include:

- Late referral from Part C
- Parent/child unavailability, holidays and child illness
- Districts waiting for outside evaluation information
- Districts allowing parents to delay eligibility determination meetings.

For the purpose of this indicator the only acceptable reason for exceeding the timeline was failure of parent to provide consent to evaluate in a timely manner.

Part C to Part B Referrals

	2009-10
a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination	234
b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday	23
c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays	190
d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services	9
e. # of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays	2
Delay in eligibility determination and IEP development by third birthday (# in a, but not b, c, d, or e)	10
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays Percent Acceptable = Acceptable / (Total Eligible) = c / (a-b-d-e)	95.0%

Source: District reported data (via IMACS) from a total of 111 districts that conducted self-assessments in 2009-10. A total of 49 of the 123 districts had received referrals from Part C.

Year	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Percent within acceptable timelines	80.3%	88.6%	91.3%	95.0%

Of the 10 children who did not have the IEP in place by the third birthday, all but two had their IEPs in place within one month of turning three. The two remaining children had their IEPs in place within two months of the third birthday, with most of the delay due to lack of parent response to phone calls and delays on the school district's part in obtaining consent for evaluation. Most of the delays were due to the inability to contact the family and/or scheduling difficulties.

The districts found out of compliance with this indicator were required to complete corrective action plans and correct the noncompliance as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of notification.

Correction of previous noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: One district had **one** findings of noncompliance issued in 2008-09. The state, through its follow-up procedures, **which include submission of a second set of timeline data for additional children transitioning from Part C to Part B**, verified that the district was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification. The state also verified that, in addition to the one finding of noncompliance, all individual noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification.

Correction of Remaining FFY2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2006 or earlier.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

The comparison of school years 2006-07 through 2009-10 shows a significant increase from 80.3% to 95.0% within acceptable timelines. It is believed that the progress on this indicator is due to a focus in both the Part B and C systems on training and technical assistance for Part C agencies and Part B Early Childhood Special Education staff. A large statewide training on C to B Transition with approximately 300 attendees from both the Part C and B systems was held in April 2010. Materials, including a videotape of the training, were posted on the web with notification of the availability of the materials sent out over the Part C and B listservs. C to B Transition was also a topic of discussion in several of the Assistant Commissioner's statewide webinars, as well as at regional and statewide conferences and meetings. Nevertheless, the 100% target was not met and, as indicated in the improvement activities for this indicator, training and technical assistance are continuing to be provided to districts regarding compliance in the area of Part C to Part B transition.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Provide training and professional development to all districts to improve collaboration and coordination with families and Part C agencies in the area of C to B Transition timelines.
- Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator

Discussion of the improvement activities follows:

Ongoing training and technical assistance: Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC) Special Education Compliance Consultants work with Office of Special Education supervisors to target the districts who need assistance in meeting the Part C to B timelines. Compliance supervisors notify RPDC compliance consultants of districts who received a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) in the area of Part C to B timelines. The RPDC consultants assisted districts in determining the reasons for the delays and developing strategies to correct the non-compliance.

Each district being reviewed in the special education monitoring cycle is required to attend self assessment training in the fall prior to their MSIP review year. In this training emphasis is placed upon public agencies' knowledge regarding students referred by Part C to B transition.

In order for new directors in the state to be properly informed and to provide guidance to their district staff regarding students referred by Part C and having an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday, a compliance training with emphasis on this timeline is a part of the New Director's Training.

The Office of Special Education provides an online training module on C to B transition. Finally, listserv messages by Office of Special Education staff and webinar presentations by Assistant Commissioner, Heidi Atkins Lieberman, remind public agencies of the importance of adhering to this timeline.

Evidence based practices and strategies: See APR overview under the category labeled MO Resources.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2009 APR, that the State is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b). Because the State reported less than 100%

State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2009 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.

DESE Response: The state has described the verification of the correction of noncompliance in the section above entitled “Correction of Previous Noncompliance.” The state was able to verify that all LEAs with identified noncompliance (1) ~~were correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) had completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).~~ **are correctly implementing 34 CFR § 300.124(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) have developed and implemented the IEP, although late, for any child for whom implementation of the IEP was not timely, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.**

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 13: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	100% of youth aged 16 and above will have an IEP that includes appropriate, measurable postsecondary goals

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

See SPP

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

See SPP

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, the State has provided new baseline, targets and Improvement Activities in the SPP. Targets and Improvement Activities have been extended through 2012-13.

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must provide a revised baseline using data from 2009-2010. Targets must remain 100%.

DESE Response: The State has provided a revised baseline in the updated SPP submitted February 1, 2011. The target remains 100%.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	NA

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

See SPP.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

See SPP.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, the State has provided new baseline and targets in the SPP. Targets and Improvement Activities have been extended through 2012-13. Two new Improvement Activities have been added.

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report a new baseline, targets, and, as needed, improvement activities.

DESE Response: The State has provided a baseline, targets and improvement activities in the updated SPP submitted February 1, 2011.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 15: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

States are required to use the "Indicator 15 Worksheet" to report data for this indicator (see Attachment A).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	100% of findings of noncompliance will be corrected within 12 months

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

Missouri met the 100% target for correction of non-compliance within twelve months. This is a slight increase over the 99.9% of correction of noncompliance within 12 months reported in the previous APR.

The Department strongly encourages districts to submit all documentation at least three months prior to the end of the 12-month timeline. The Compliance Supervisors and RPDC Consultants receive monthly updates of districts still in CAP status and the indicators that remain out of compliance. Through phone calls and hands-on assistance, the districts are reminded often of the requirement for correction of all noncompliance within the 12-month timeframe.

A total of 115 districts and 9 charter schools had monitoring reports issued during 2008-09, resulting in a total of 124 responsible public agencies. The Special Education monitoring follows the five-year accreditation cycle for the state of Missouri. Every district is reviewed once within the five year cycle of the Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP). For more information on the Special Education monitoring process, please see the APR Overview titled 4th Cycle Focus on State Performance Plan Indicators. Results of these reviews are provided in the tables below. The columns of the tables are as follows:

- # of LEAs issued findings in 2008-09 – the total number of agencies that had findings of noncompliance issued in 2008-09
- # of Findings of noncompliance identified in 2008-09 – the total number of monitoring indicators and/or dispute resolution allegations found out of compliance across the districts/agencies reviewed. This is a duplicated count of districts/agencies when districts/agencies had more than one finding of noncompliance in an SPP indicator area
- # of Findings of noncompliance for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification – the total number of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year from the date of the reports to districts

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.	Monitoring Activities: Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review, Desk Audit, On-Site Visits, or Other	0	0	0
2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school.				
14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.	Dispute Resolution: Complaints, Hearings	0	0	0
3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments.	Monitoring Activities:	21	55	55
7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrated improved outcomes.	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
4A. Percent of districts identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year.	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	0
	Dispute Resolution:	1	1	1
5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 -educational placements.	Monitoring Activities:	13	29	29
6. Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 – early childhood placement.	Dispute Resolution:	2	8	8
8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.	Monitoring Activities:	63	268	268
	Dispute Resolution:	2	2	2
9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Monitoring Activities:	0	0	0
10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0

Indicator/Indicator Clusters	General Supervision System Components	# of LEAs Issued Findings in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(a) # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 (7/1/08 to 6/30/09)	(b) # of Findings of noncompliance from (a) for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
11. Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.	Monitoring Activities:	56	135	135
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
12. Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	Monitoring Activities:	1	1	1
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable student to meet the post-secondary goals.	Monitoring Activities:	31	81	81
	Dispute Resolution:	0	0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			580	580
Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column (b) sum divided by column (a) sum) times 100.			(b) / (a) X 100 =	100.0%

Correction of previous noncompliance

Correction of FFY 2008 Findings of Noncompliance: Missouri had 100% of the findings of noncompliance identified in 2008-09 timely corrected and verified within one year of notification, including correction of all individual noncompliance. The state, through its follow-up procedures, verified that all districts were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements relating to all areas of identified noncompliance and had completed all required actions within one year of notification in 100% of the files reviewed. The state also verified that, in addition to the findings of noncompliance, all individual noncompliance was corrected within one year of notification, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA.

Correction of Remaining FFY2007 Findings of Noncompliance (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2007.

Correction of Any Remaining Findings of Noncompliance from FFY 2006 or Earlier (if applicable): N/A. There were no remaining findings of noncompliance from FFY 2006 or earlier.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Provide a comprehensive general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance.
- Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of corrective action plans.
- Manage system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance

- Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Provide a comprehensive general supervision system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance: As the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) prepared to enter into a new Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) five year monitoring cycle, which began in 2006-07, the Office of Special Education worked closely with National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and several groups of stakeholders on focused monitoring procedures. As described in the APR Overview, the procedures focus strongly on the SPP performance areas by establishing criteria for Graduation and Dropout Rates, Performance on Statewide Assessments and LRE. Districts not meeting the established criteria are required to complete both a self-assessment file review using related compliance indicators and an improvement plan related to those performance areas. Results of the self assessment (file review) are verified through a Office of Special Education desk review, and Improvement Plans are also reviewed using a scoring guide developed with the assistance of the North Central Regional Resource Center (NCRRC). See the APR overview for a description of focused monitoring on-site reviews in 4th cycle. This monitoring system rewards districts that are demonstrating solid performance in key SPP areas.

In addition to the focused file review, we require a file review for all districts during their monitoring year in the areas of postsecondary transition (Indicator 13), referral, review of existing data, and evaluation based on identified statewide concerns in these areas. In addition, we collect data on initial evaluations and Part C to B transition timelines and monitor for compliance in these areas. Corrective Action Plans are required for any identified non-compliance, and this must be corrected within 12 months of the district's notification of the findings. Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web based monitoring system (IMACS) and more frequent contact by RPDC consultants and DESE supervisors. Districts are informed about enforcement actions that may be taken when they attend the required self assessment training and through correspondence regarding findings of non-compliance. Districts must also correct findings of non-compliance on an individual child basis within 90 days of the receipt of the report of noncompliance. Compliance supervisors request documentation showing that the individual noncompliance has been corrected and any other required actions (such as compensatory services, evaluations completed) have been put in place. Districts do not receive a report of correction of all noncompliance until this process is complete.

The monitoring/general supervision system is also closely linked with the Department's MSIP process, which is tied to district accreditation. Results of special education monitoring, including results of data reviews and improvement planning, are highlighted in the district's MSIP report. This is important, because the MSIP report receives a high level of attention from the district, the local board of education and the community.

Provide training and professional development through the RPDC Consultants for development and implementation of corrective action plans: Many strategies are in place to provide technical assistance to districts that were required to provide evidence of correction of non-compliance within 12 months. Emphasis is placed upon ensuring that DESE compliance supervisors have a heightened awareness of the districts that have need of technical assistance in order to correct non-compliance. An agenda item in regular staff meetings with compliance supervisors addresses districts that are out of compliance, and the progress being made with those districts to correct their non-compliance. When a supervisor encounters difficulty in providing the technical assistance to a district via phone or email, the RPDC compliance consultant assigned to the district is contacted and asked to make a personal visit to the district to provide assistance.

In the 4th Cycle Monitoring training and other state-wide conferences such as the Special Education Administrator's Conference emphasis is placed upon state targets to ensure districts that are preparing for their MSIP review understand the importance placed upon meeting targets for students' performance. Fourth Cycle Monitoring training maintains its focus upon the importance of correction of non-compliance.

DESE has five regional compliance consultants across the state. These consultants work with districts that have remaining noncompliance as well as providing training and technical assistance on compliance

standards and indicators to all districts. Each district with identified noncompliance is assigned to a compliance consultant who assists the districts in correcting the noncompliance as soon as possible after the district receives the report, but in no case later than 12 months after the date of the report.

Communication between compliance supervisors and RPDC compliance consultants provides a strong base for the regional support system for corrective action plans and improvement plans. Updates about the status of districts' correction of non-compliance are provided to RPDC consultants through meetings, email, and telephone. This ongoing communication results in timely correction of non-compliance.

Manage system to ensure timely correction of noncompliance: The IMACS is the web-based monitoring management system used to monitor the districts' evidence of correction of non-compliance. The system is designed to provide timely feedback to districts as they provide documentation for evidence of correction to compliance supervisors. Regular staff meetings with compliance supervisors and weekly phone calls with the contracted company, Leader Services, has improved the implementation of IMACS and has increased its usability for districts. Staff will continue to work closely with Leader and districts to provide a comprehensive system to monitor correction of non-compliance.

The assistant director and data specialist of the Compliance section work closely to communicate to compliance supervisors when district timelines are approaching for correction of non-compliance in 12 months. This diligence has resulted in an extremely high level of correction of non-compliance within 12 months in our state. The system we have put in place has been successful and we plan to continue this coordination of follow-up reviews.

The compliance data specialist generates regular data reports to track correction of non-compliance. These reports are used to evaluate the need for actions to be taken to ensure correction within 12 months such as phone calls, letters and other contacts with district administration. These actions ensure that the corrections are made and verified within one year of notification. Staff find the generation of data reports to track correction of non-compliance effective and will continue to use these reports for that purpose.

Provide information on evidence based practices and strategies for improving performance on this indicator: See APR overview under the category labeled MO Resources.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-109:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13). The wording of two Improvement Activities in the SPP has been revised to provide clarity.

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: In reporting on correction of noncompliance in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2009 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet.

In responding to Indicators 11 and 12 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.

As stated in OSEP's February 18, 2010 verification visit letter, the State was required to: (1) submit an assurance that it has finalized and is implementing its new procedures for ensuring correction of noncompliance identified through hearing officer decisions and tracking correction of any noncompliance identified through hearing officer decisions; and (2) clarify how the State ensures that the files selected by

local educational agencies to demonstrate correction of noncompliance are representative of all student files with prior noncompliance as required under 34 CFR §300.149. The State provided this assurance and clarification in its April 8, 2010 letter to OSEP.

DESE Response: See Activity descriptions above for follow-up procedures for correct implementation of specific regulatory requirements and correction of individual noncompliance.

As stated above all noncompliance was corrected and verified within one year. Correction of noncompliance for Indicators 11 and 12 was addressed under those indicators. The state used the Indicator 15 worksheet to provide the data for this indicator. The worksheet is replicated in this document.

As indicated in the statement above, the State provided the required assurance and clarification in its April 8, 2010 letter to OSEP.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 16: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = $[(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) \text{ divided by } 1.1] \text{ times } 100$.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	100% of complaints will be resolved within 60 day or extended timelines.

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

Missouri met the target of 100% of complaints resolved within 60 days or appropriately extended timelines.

Child Complaints

School Year	Total Child Complaints Filed	Total Reports Issued	Total Child Complaints Within 60 Days	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline with Appropriate Extensions	Total Child Complaints Beyond 60 Day Timeline without Appropriate Extensions	Percent resolved within 60 days or extended timelines
2005-06	104	92	76	16	0	100.0%
2006-07	99	81	75	6	0	100.0%
2007-08	77	63	57	6	0	100.0%
2008-09	92	72	69	3	0	100.0%
2009-10	106	87	83	4	0	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

Missouri continues to meet the target of 100% compliance with this indicator.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Manage current program to maintain compliance with 60 day timeline for resolution of child complaints.
- Provide online training of complaint system for stakeholders.

Discussion of improvement activities follows:

Maintain compliance with timelines: DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for issuance of child complaints. Database reports are reviewed weekly to ensure that timelines are met and that appropriate extensions are made when necessary.

Complaint System Web Training: In September 2007, the Office of Special Education staff completed a web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the complaint system which includes a description of the timelines of the complaint system for child complaints. Notices are sent to the field at least twice annually to remind school staff and parent advocacy groups of the availability of this web training. In spring 2010, the video was shown during a meeting between Department staff and staff of Missouri Protection and Advocacy. The training is reviewed annually to determine if there is a need for revision. The most recent review of the training indicated that there is no need for revision at this time.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 17: Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = $[(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) \text{ divided by } 3.2] \text{ times } 100$.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	100% of due process hearings will be fully adjudicated within 45 day or appropriately extended timelines.

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

Two due process hearings were filed and fully adjudicated during 2009-10. One was completed within timelines with no extension and the second was completed within timelines with appropriate extension, resulting in 100% compliance for this indicator.

Due Process Hearing Requests

Year	Fully Adjudicated Hearings (by June 30)	Fully Adjudicated Hearings within timeline or within extended timeline	Fully Adjudicated Hearings Beyond Timeline without Extension	Percent Fully Adjudicated within 45 Days or Extended Timeline
2005-06	2	2	0	100.0%
2006-07	3	3	0	100.0%
2007-08	1	1	0	100.0%
2008-09	3	2	1	66.7%
2009-10	2	2	0	100.0%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

The State met the target of 100% for this indicator and has met that target for every year with the exception of 2008-2009 when one hearing exceeded timelines without an appropriate extension by the hearing chair. Using the system in place for addressing contract violations, the contract of that hearing chair was not renewed and all hearings since that time have been adjudicated within required timelines or extended appropriately.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Manage current program to maintain compliance with 60 day timeline for resolution of child complaints.
- Provide online training of complaint system for stakeholders.

Discussion of improvement activities follows:

Maintain compliance with timelines: DESE continues to use a database to record and monitor the timelines for completion of fully adjudicated due process hearings. Database reports are reviewed weekly to ensure that timelines are met and that appropriate extensions are made when necessary.

Complaint System Web Training: In September 2007, the Office of Special Education staff completed a web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the dispute resolution system which includes a description of the timelines for due process hearings. Notices are sent to the field at least twice annually to remind school staff and parent advocacy groups of the availability of this web training. In spring 2010, the video was shown during a meeting between Department staff and staff of Missouri Protection and Advocacy. The training is reviewed annually to determine if there is a need for revision. The most recent review of the training indicated that there is no need for revision at this time.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2009 APR, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.

State response: Current procedures and improvement activities resulted in 100% compliance on this indicator for four of the last five years. A review of the state's procedures and improvement activities did not reveal a need for any changes.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 18: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	35.2% of hearing requests that go to resolution sessions will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

At 55.2% of resolution sessions resulting in settlement agreements, Missouri met the target of 35.2% established for the 2009-10 school year.

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Resolution Sessions	32	52	41	25	29
Settlement Agreements	15	24	20	11	16
Percent Settlement Agreements	46.9%	46.2%	48.8%	44.0%	55.2%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

The data for 2009-10 indicates a significant increase from the previous year in the percent of resolution sessions resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. The state met the target for this indicator. It is believed that the increase is due to the state's implementation of monitoring procedures for holding resolution sessions within 15 days of the filing of a due process hearing request, as well as dissemination of information regarding resolution sessions by the State Agency and the PTI.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Collect information regarding resolution session outcomes to improve data collection.

Discussion of this improvement activity follows:

During 2009-10 procedures were developed and implemented to track and follow-up on resolution session timelines and outcomes. SEA staff are assigned when a request for a Due Process Hearing is filed. Staff communicates with the LEA to remind them of the requirement to conduct a Resolution Session and of the timelines. Follow-up communication is conducted until the session is held and an outcome determined or until one or both parties agrees not to conduct the Resolution Session and to proceed with the Due Process Hearing.

An updated Parent's Guide to Special Education was completed in the spring of 2007. This guide was a collaborative effort between MPACT and Office of Special Education staff to assist parents in understanding the special education process in Missouri including the complaint system. Copies of this guide have been given to each district in the state and are available free of charge for dissemination. It is also available free of charge upon request to any person or organization and is posted on the Office of

Special Education website. Reminders of the availability of the Parent's Guide are sent regularly to the field.

In September 2007, the Office of Special Education staff completed a web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the dispute resolution system which includes a description of the timelines for due process hearings. Notices are sent to the field at least twice annually to remind school staff and parent advocacy groups of the availability of this web training. In spring 2010, the video was shown during a meeting between Department staff and staff of Missouri Protection and Advocacy. The training is reviewed annually to determine if there is a need for revision. The most recent review of the training indicated that there is no need for revision at this time.

The Missouri PTI (Missouri Parent's Act [MPACT]) as part of their contractual agreement with the Department provides training and information to Missouri parents regarding the complaint system, including information on mediation and resolution sessions. In 2009-10, MPACT conducted trainings for 198 parents and 36 professionals on Disagreement Resolution. They also provided one-one-one assistance for 230 parents concerning due process and resolution.

The Office of Special Education uses its special education listserv (SEL/SELS2) to periodically remind the field about parent's rights and dissemination of documents to families which describe those rights, including the Parent's Guide, the Procedural Safeguards and our web-based training.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 19: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	35.2% of mediations will result in mediation agreements

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

Missouri met the 2009-10 target with ~~93.3~~ **90.0**% percent of mediations resulting in mediation agreements.

	Mediation Agreements	Total Mediations Held	Percent with Agreements
2005-06	4	6	66.7%
2006-07	15	27	55.5%
2007-08	11	17	64.7%
2008-09	13	16	81.3%
2009-10	28 27	30	93.3 90.0 %

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

With ~~93.3~~ **90.0**% of mediations resulting in a mediation agreement, Missouri met the target of 35.2% for 2009-10.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Provide information on the Missouri complaint system through the Parent's Guide to Special Education.

Discussion of the improvement activity follows:

An updated Parent's Guide to Special Education was completed in the spring of 2007. This guide was a collaborative effort between MPACT and Office of Special Education staff to assist parents in understanding the special education process in Missouri including the complaint system. Copies of this guide have been given to each district in the state and are available free of charge for dissemination. It is also available free of charge upon request to any person or organization and is posted on the Office of Special Education website. Reminders of the availability of the Parent's Guide are sent regularly to the field.

In September 2007, the Office of Special Education staff completed a web-based video to assist parents, districts, advocates, and others on the procedures of the dispute resolution system which includes a description of the timelines for due process hearings. Notices are sent to the field at least twice annually to remind school staff and parent advocacy groups of the availability of this web training. In spring 2010, the video was shown during a meeting between Department staff and staff of Missouri Protection and Advocacy. The training is reviewed annually to determine if there is a need for revision. The most recent review of the training indicated that there is no need for revision at this time.

The Missouri PTI (Missouri Parent's Act [MPACT]) as part of their contractual agreement with the Department provides training and information to Missouri parents regarding the complaint system, including information on mediation and resolution sessions. In 2009-10, MPACT conducted trainings for 198 parents and 36 professionals on Disagreement Resolution. They also provided one-on-one assistance for 203 parents concerning the child complaint and mediation processes.

The Office of Special Education uses its special education listserv (SEL/SELS2) to periodically remind the field about parent's rights and dissemination of documents to families which describe those rights, including the Parent's Guide, the Procedural Safeguards and our web-based training.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP did not require a state response on this indicator.

Part B State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2009-10

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Indicator 20: State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Measurement:

State reported data, including 618 data and Annual Performance Report data, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity; placement; November 1 for exiting, discipline, personnel; and February 1 for Annual Performance Reports); and
- b. Accurate, including covering the correct year

States are required to use the "Indicator 20 Scoring Rubric" for reporting data for this indicator (see Attachment B).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2009-10	100% of state reported data are timely and accurate

Actual Target Data for 2009-10:

Missouri's score of 100% met the target for the requirement to submit timely and accurate data.

Missouri utilizes a variety of data sources to compile data for the Annual Performance Report and the Section 618 data. Sources include the following:

- MOSIS – Missouri Student Information System is a student level collection system for the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. MOSIS is taking the previous aggregate Core Data Collection system to the student level. The data are aggregated and used for the Section 618 child count, placement, exiting, discipline and personnel reporting. These data are also used for APR Indicators 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 14. MOSIS includes a variety of data edit checks to ensure consistency and accuracy of data
- Core Data Collection System – Core Data is a web-based system used to collect data from districts. Most of the collections for student data are now being populated with data from the MOSIS system. The collections populated with MOSIS data continue to utilize edit checking logic as a second screening of the data
- Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) – MAP data are used by the Department for NCLB/AYP reporting and district accreditation purposes, among others. Pre-coding of student information and a demographic clean-up window ensures accurate information. MAP data are used for the Section 618 Assessment table and for APR Indicator 3
- IMACS – the web-based Improvement Monitoring, Accountability and Compliance System is used to gather data through special education monitoring self-assessments. Data collected through IMACS and verified by desk review include Timelines for Part C to Part B Transition (APR 12), Evaluation Timelines (APR 11), Transition Plans (APR 13) and correction of noncompliance (APR 15). IMACS is also used to conduct disproportionality reviews (APR 9/10)
- Dispute Resolution Database – the database is used to record information on child complaints, due process hearing requests, mediations and resolution sessions. The database is used to

monitor timelines throughout the year, and data are used for the Section 618 Dispute Resolution table and for APR Indicators 15-19

- Other - The data collections for Parent Involvement (APR 8) are described in the respective SPP or APR sections.

Missouri utilized OSEP's scoring rubric to evaluate the accuracy and timeliness of data collected for 2009-10. The results are below:

SPP/APR Data – Indicator 20			
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Total
1	1	NA	1
2	1	NA	1
3A	1	1	2
3B	1	1	2
3C	1	1	2
4A	1	1	2
4B	1	1	2
5	1	1	2
7	1	1	2
8	1	1	2
9	1	1	2
10	1	1	2
11	1	1	2
12	1	1	2
13	1	1	2
14	1	1	2
15	1	1	2
16	1	1	2
17	1	1	2
18	1	1	2
19	1	1	2
		Subtotal	40
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points – If the FFY 2009 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	Grand Total – Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		45.00

618 Data – Indicator 20					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 – Child Count Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 – Personnel Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 3 – Ed. Environments Due Date: 2/1/10	1	1	1	1	4
Table 4 – Exiting Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 5 – Discipline Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
Table 6 – State Assessment Due Date: 2/1/11	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
Table 7 – Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/10	1	1	1	N/A	3
				Subtotal	21
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal x 2.143)		45.00

Indicator #20 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	45.00
B. 618 Grand Total	45.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	90.00
Total N/A in APR	0
Total N/A in 618	0
Base	90.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base) =	1.000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00%

As indicated above, state reported data for 2009-10 were submitted in a timely fashion and were accurate as defined by OSEP's scoring rubric.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2009-10:

Missouri met the target of 100% compliance with the requirement to submit timely and accurate data for 2009-10.

The Office of Special Education continues with data verification efforts as described in the SPP.

- The majority of data required by Section 618 of IDEA and data used for the SPP/APR are collected through the new MOSIS collection system which populates the web-based Core Data Collection System. Manuals with reporting instructions and data edits are important features of both the MOSIS and Core Data systems. New special education directors are trained on the system each year, with on-going technical assistance provided by Department staff. The end-of-year collections for 2007-08 were the first special education collections to be collected solely through MOSIS. Throughout 2009-10, Office of Data System Management Special Education staff worked extensively with districts to ensure the accuracy of the data collected at the student level

- Data editing and validation are handled by Department staff through a variety of means including year to year checks, additional data edits, reports to districts, etc. Any questionable elements are either verified as correct or are corrected by the districts
- Extensive data profiles have been provided to districts for several years and are also available to the public. These profiles, along with using the data for monitoring and district selection purposes, have ensured more accurate data collection and reporting
- Staff working with Special Education data serve as active members of the Department's Core Data Team, and thus have input into changes that may impact the special education data gathered and housed at the Department. The Core Data Team has ensured that the shift to student-level collections through MOSIS is successful and that the data needs of the various Department programs are met
- An additional method of data verification has come about due to the selection of districts for monitoring and grant opportunities based on district performance data
- Data gathered through IMACS all undergo verification by Compliance Supervisors, and the Supervisors' determinations supersede district responses if different

These efforts have allowed the Office of Special Education to identify and correct many errors made by districts when submitting special education data. Due to this, most errors are corrected prior to federal data submissions.

Improvement activities for 2009-10 included the following:

- Support the development and implementation of Missouri's Student Information System (MOSIS)
- Provide information to State Supervisors of Instruction and school administrators regarding data collection and reporting for IDEA
- Develop and manage web-based data system (FormHog) for management of contracts and data collection for statewide initiatives (SW-PBS, MIM, Rtl and National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD)):

Discussion of these improvement activities follows:

Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS): As noted above, the Department has fully implemented a student level data collection. Staff that work with special education data is part of a DESE workgroup that identified and defined the necessary data elements. The Department has worked to ensure that definitions and interpretations of data elements are accurate and consistent across programs. Extensive technical assistance to districts ensures smooth implementation and accuracy of data.

During 2009-10, the Department finalized and implemented a rubric for evaluating the timeliness and accuracy of district data submissions. Deadlines by which data must be certified through MOSIS were established and tracked. A system was put in place to regularly contact districts who had not yet certified their data in order to help them meet the deadline. Three districts did not meet the deadline for the child count submission, eight districts did not meet the deadline for the educator course/assignment submission, and one district did not meet the deadline for the discipline submission.

Staff work closely with districts to resolve accuracy issues, therefore all districts received full credit for the accuracy of data submissions.

Work with State Supervisors of Instruction and school administrators to discuss data accuracy and use: While discussions specific to this topic have not been held, the topic is embedded in most trainings and conversations that involve the special education system of general supervision. District and DESE personnel are aware that data are being used to trigger requirements for self-assessment purposes, select districts for on-site reviews, report to the public and provide local Determinations to districts, among other things. All of these endeavors have emphasized the importance of data accuracy.

Form Hog: The Office of Special Education has contracted with the company Form Hog, Inc. to create and provide an on-line Contract Development and Management system. The purpose of this system is to develop scopes of work and budgets, provide a central location for vendor contact information, store all information related to vendor contracts (e.g. contract appendices, signed contract agreements, reports, and invoices), store all definitions for terms used in the development of forms, and

track vendor programmatic, impact, and fiscal activities. An approval process is built into the system to facilitate work flow for scope of work and budget development, as well as processing invoices and reviewing reports. A data query and reporting tool has been developed. This tool enables Office of Special Education and other Department staff to evaluate vendor activities and use of funds, as well as determine the alignment of vendor activities with SPP Improvement Activities and Indicators.

In addition to the Contract Development and Management system, Form Hog, Inc. has developed and provided on-line district data collection systems for the Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support (SW-PBS) and Missouri Integrated Model (MIM) statewide initiatives. Data have been collected in these systems on an annual basis since the 2008-09 school year from districts involved in each initiative. In 2010-11, district data collection systems for the Response to Intervention (RtI) and National Dropout Prevention Center-Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD) initiatives will be added. The district data collection systems allow district staff to enter data as specified for the various initiatives in a standardized format. Statewide users can manage and manipulate the data by using the data query and reporting tool in the Form Hog system to evaluate activities on a district, regional, and statewide level.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2009-10:

Per OSEP instructions, SPP targets and Improvement Activities have been extended for an additional two years (2011-12 and 2012-13).

These changes were presented to and approved by the Missouri Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) in December 2010.

MO FFY 2008 (2008-09) Response Table:

OSEP Analysis/Next Steps: In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2009 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.

State Response: The state used the Indicator 20 Data Rubric to provide the data for this indicator. The rubric is replicated in this document.